

102ND YEAR

OCTOBER, 1938

No. 407

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

OCT 25 1938

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

A QUARTERLY AND CRITICAL JOURNAL

This issue includes

“Voltaire” and the Censors

BY DENIS GWYNN

Joseph de Maistre

BY ALGERNON CECIL

The Church in Spain

BY HUGH BROUGHALL

Liberty and the State

BY REV. S. J. GOSLING

LONDON

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE LTD.

Price 3s. 6d. or \$1 net. Yearly Subscription, 15s. or \$4 Post Free.

Registered at the Post Office, Chicago, as Second-Class Matter.

COMMUNICATIONS in regard
to articles and all books for review,
as well as all communications respecting
the Publishing Department, should be
addressed to **BURNS OATES & WASH-
BURN**, Ltd., 43, 44, 45 Newgate
Street, London, E.C.1. Advertisements
should reach the Publishers not later
than the 10th of the last month of each
Quarter.

No MSS. can be returned unless
accompanied by stamped addressed en-
velopes. Articles can only be received
on the understanding that publication
alone is a guarantee of acceptance and
payment.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is published
on or about the 1st of January, April,
July, and October.

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN,
AT THE ANCHOR
PRESS, TIPTREE,
ESSEX





THE DUBLIN REVIEW

October, November, December,
1938

Associate Editors :

DENIS GWYNN
LORD CLONMORE

LONDON
BURNS OATES AND
WASHBOURNE LTD.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

DENIS GWYNN is the principal literary adviser to Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., and joint editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW

HUGH BROUGHALL is the pseudonym of an exceptionally well-informed expert who recently made a tour of National Spain.

REV. S. J. GOSLING has been editor of the "Sower" since 1930.

ARNOLD LUNN has become one of the ablest of Catholic controversialists, with special knowledge of Communist propaganda methods.

REV. EDWARD QUINN has specialized on the problems of Central Europe.

HUGH A. LAW, formerly M.P. for County Donegal, has an intimate knowledge of Irish history in the Stuart period.

ALGERNON CECIL is one of the most gifted men of letters among English converts to the Catholic Church.

DOM ALBAN LÉOTAUD, who is a monk of Prinknash Abbey, has had special access to sixteenth-century archives.

REV. HUMPHREY JOHNSON, of the Birmingham Oratory, has written "Anthropology and the Fall" besides his well-known studies of the Vatican question.

PRINCE P. TASKEVICH-BALASCHEFF was President of the National Union in the Russian Duma and a close collaborator of Stolypin.

EDWARD BOWRON has travelled widely and has already contributed to the more serious Catholic periodicals.

RONALD RICHINGS is on the staff of the Oratory School, Caversham.

CONTENTS

OCTOBER, NOVEMBER, DECEMBER

1938

	PAGE
“Voltaire” and the Censors	By Denis Gwynn 197
The Church in Spain	By Hugh Broughall 212
Liberty and Some Modern Theories of the State	By Rev. S. J. Gosling 225
“A Tragic Misapprehension”	By Arnold Lunn 242
The Survival of Christendom	By Rev. Edward Quinn 257
Charles Wogan, Soldier and Diplomatist	By Hugh A. Law 272
Joseph de Maistre	By Algernon Cecil 286
The Journal of Prior William More of Worcester	By Dom Alban Léotaud, O.S.B. 302
Prehistory and the Fall of Man	By Rev. Humphrey J. T. Johnson, Cong. Orat. 316
Stolypin	By P. Taskevich-Balascheff 331
Christianity in Sweden	By Edward Bowron 343
The Fighting Bishop	By Ronald Richings 354
Some Recent Books	— — — — — 366

COMMUNISM AND MAN; A PHILOSOPHY OF WORK; CHRIST AND THE WORKERS;
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND REUNION; ANGLICANISM IN TRANSITION;
WORLD COMMUNITY; THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE IN A NON-CHRISTIAN WORLD;
MARY'S PART IN OUR REDEMPTION; CONFIRMATION IN THE MODERN WORLD;
THE FASCIST, HIS STATE AND HIS MIND; ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS; THE
ORIGIN OF RUSSIAN COMMUNISM; THE MISSION OF AUSTRIA; POEMS,
BY EILEEN DUGGAN; CHAPTER AND VERSE; INSURRECTION VERSUS
RESURRECTION; THE CATHOLIC EASTERN CHURCHES; THE DISSIDENT
EASTERN CHURCHES; HISTOIRE DE L'ÉGLISE; LUDWIG II OF BAVARIA;
THE CHARITY SCHOOL MOVEMENT; MOUNTAINS OF THE MOON; MARIA DE
LA LUZ; MEMORIES OF CHARLES DE FOUCAUD; THE WHITE FATHERS
IN AFRICA.

THE CRITERION

A QUARTERLY REVIEW EDITED BY T. S. ELIOT

OCTOBER, 1938

CONTENTS

THE BRESSEY REPORT	John Betjeman
THE MEASURE OF KAFKA	Montgomery Belgion
POEM	Dylan Thomas
EVOLUTION	K. E. Barlow
THE NOVELS OF GEORGE ELIOT	S. L. Bethell
PLAIN SPEECH FOR TWO	Brian Coffey
A COMMENTARY			
ART CHRONICLE	Roger Hinks
MUSIC CHRONICLE	Philip F. Radcliffe
BROADCASTING CHRONICLE	Geoffrey Tandy
FICTION CHRONICLE	A. Desmond Hawkins
CORRESPONDENCE	Geoffrey Stone ; Montgomery Belgion ; A. Desmond Hawkins

BOOKS OF THE QUARTER :

<i>Coral Gardens</i>	Charles Madge
<i>Sir Charles Firth</i>	Rev. Charles Smyth
<i>Mr. Collingwood's Aesthetics</i>	E. W. F. Tomlin
<i>Recent Verse</i>	Janet Adam Smith
<i>The Tyranny of Words</i>	J. M. Reeves
<i>Political Thought of Coleridge</i>	George Every, S.S.M.
<i>Welbeck Abbey</i>	Bonamy Dobré
<i>Sir David Lyndsay</i>	Hugh MacDiarmid
<i>Symbolism and Belief</i>	Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J.
<i>Thomas Hardy</i>	Frank Chapman
<i>St. Bonaventura</i>	A. N. Prior
<i>The Necessity of Freedom</i>	H. W. J. Edwards
<i>History of the Dance</i>	Zenka Bartek
<i>Mr. Nock on St. Paul</i>	Rev. Geoffrey Curtis, C.R.
<i>The World's Body</i>	Michael Roberts
<i>Nicholas Ferrar</i>	Bernard Blackstone
<i>The Lord General</i>	John Short

SHORTER NOTICES

PERIODICALS

30s. per annum \$7.50 in the U.S.A

FABER & FABER LIMITED

24 Russell Square, London, W.C.1

The Dublin Review

OCTOBER, 1938

No. 407

“VOLTAIRE” AND THE CENSORS

IN challenging the demand of the Holy Office that his book on Voltaire should be withdrawn Mr. Alfred Noyes has raised an issue which concerns every Catholic author and publisher or editor; and it may be well to consider the present conditions in some detail. The claims of the ecclesiastical censors have undoubtedly produced a certain amount of inconvenience in some cases, and the practice has apparently varied in different places. If the dispute with Mr. Noyes leads to the adoption of a more rigid application of the rules of Canon Law it would seem more than likely that his impulsive challenge will result in less rather than greater freedom for both authors and publishers. The present writer has had considerable experience of the censorship as a publisher; and in making any suggestions or criticisms he wishes first to express the most sincere appreciation of the helpfulness and the courtesy which the authorities have invariably shown.

As the practice of religious censorship would seem to be very imperfectly known even among the clergy, a simple statement of it is necessary. It must be the experience of all Catholic publishers that most priests or religious who wish to have a new book published have little idea of what steps are needed to obtain the *imprimatur*. The Canon Law, in fact, gives the choice of three *imprimaturs*. The book may be submitted for censorship to the ordinary of the diocese where the author lives, or where the publisher has his business, or where the book is printed. If the author is a member of a religious congregation he is required also to obtain the *nihil obstat* of his own superiors. There have been cases from time to time where this *nihil obstat* of the religious superiors has been obtained but the diocesan censors have required certain alterations in the text.

In other instances, when the book has been submitted to both censors at the same time, the diocesan censor has made different objections or has made none. Such disagreements naturally produce embarrassment to both censorships; and for this reason it is now a rule in certain dioceses that no book which also requires the *imprimatur* of religious superiors will be considered until that *imprimatur* has first been obtained.

These regulations frequently cause alarm to writers who have not previously given any thought to the question of censorship; but in practice the *imprimatur* is usually little more than a formality. They are particularly alarming to converts, who immediately wonder whether the censor will disagree with this or that opinion or will disapprove of any reference being made to some controversial subject. These false impressions are, of course, shared by a large proportion of readers, who know nothing of the technique of censorship and assume that it is much more comprehensive and interfering than it is, or was ever intended to be. They have no knowledge of what books do or do not require censorship; and they certainly cannot be expected to know that authors and publishers, and even the religious authorities themselves, are in considerable doubt as to what publications must be submitted for censorship.

Mr. Noyes, according to his own statement in *The Times*, appears to have considered the question, and he consulted his publisher, Mr. Sheed, who has wide experience in such matters, and also has some knowledge of the Canon Law. Mr. Sheed, in another letter to *The Times*, accepts full responsibility for having assured Mr. Noyes that his book need not be submitted to the censors. "It was I," he writes, "not any ecclesiastical authority, who advised him that the book did not need an *imprimatur*. It seemed to me that it did not come under any of the categories touched in Canon Law. I may quite well have been wrong upon this; but it was my opinion." The expert in these matters may be surprised that Mr. Sheed should have had any doubt in the matter; but everybody will believe that Mr. Sheed acted in all sincerity, and that he had also given the

question serious attention, as it must have arisen frequently in his experience as a Catholic publisher.

The fact remains that a Catholic publisher who had had constant dealings with the ecclesiastical censors, and who had on at least one previous occasion been obliged to consider the question closely because another of his books incurred disapproval in Rome, was genuinely convinced that censorship was not required in this case. The DUBLIN REVIEW is not the place for any technical discussion of how the relevant Articles of the Canon Law should be construed. Any reasonable person would far prefer that they should not be too strictly defined, since the Holy Office would naturally safeguard its position in any such controversy by extending its rules to prevent any conceivable source of trouble. All that need be said here is that in practice the ecclesiastical censors in England insist that any Catholic author or Catholic publisher who publishes a work which concerns faith or morals is obliged to obtain an *imprimatur* before publication. Particularly, every priest is required to get an *imprimatur*. Moreover, the *imprimatur* is to be printed in every book of the kind, unless some serious reason can be shown for omitting it.

But these apparently simple regulations would become ridiculous if they were enforced in every conceivable case. Suppose, for instance, that a priest were to write detective stories for a non-Catholic publisher. If the priest cannot be trusted to avoid heresy in such works there might be reason for submitting it to the censors ; but it would be obviously absurd to print the *imprimatur* in such a book. Or if a Catholic writes original verses to be printed on a Christmas card, is the rule to be enforced there ? If he writes a hymn for use in churches the *imprimatur* would obviously be desirable as well as necessary. Or take the case of Sir Richard Terry's fine collection of two hundred folk carols. Here is a book intended chiefly for musical people of all faiths or none. His primary purpose undoubtedly was to encourage Catholic music and to have the carols sung by Catholic choirs. He brought it to our firm as Catholic publishers, and in Canon Law both we and Sir Richard were apparently obliged to

obtain an *imprimatur* for it. Actually we forgot to apply for an *imprimatur*, and I would never have thought further of the matter if this recent controversy had not arisen. That a Catholic author publishing Catholic music with a Catholic firm should obtain an *imprimatur* seems only natural. But if Sir Richard had taken his book to a non-Catholic firm of musical publishers would it have been his duty to insist upon their obtaining and also publishing the *imprimatur*? I only mention this as an instance of the problems which must arise.

Wider difficulties are involved in connection with the Catholic newspapers. To exercise censorship over their contents from week to week would be a physical impossibility, unless a censor was appointed to read all the proofs up to the last minute when a newspaper closes down for printing. In practice, therefore, the Catholic newspapers in this country, as elsewhere, are exempt from any censorship at all. The editor's discretion and common sense are regarded as a sufficient guarantee against heresy. And the clergy who write for the Catholic newspapers are also generally free to that extent from such censorship. The same freedom also applies to articles contributed to the Catholic reviews. Some religious congregations may insist that their members write nothing which has not first been "vetted" by their own censors; but the editors are unaware of such previous censorship and publish freely on their own responsibility. But a curious anomaly arises when a priest or a layman wishes to publish in book form a collection of his writings in such periodicals. The censors usually insist that such collections of articles require censorship, even if they have already been published serially without an *imprimatur*. This applies, for instance, to any series of sermons which have been printed in a weekly paper.

Yet the practice is not the same everywhere. In regard to sermons or devotional writings, no reasonable author would object to censorship. But in matters of public controversy, like social reform, the Catholic newspapers provide a free platform, and there is always a possibility that the censor would object to certain views

being put forward by a priest on the ground that they might be taken as expressing the considered opinion of the Church. In such cases there is sometimes a difference of outlook in different dioceses, and the author is fully entitled to ask for the *imprimatur* of his own bishop instead of submitting it to Westminster, or Dublin, or wherever the publisher may have his headquarters. But apart from such possible differences in outlook, is there really any necessity that articles which have already reached a very wide public in a Catholic newspaper should require censorship, and perhaps modification, before they are allowed to be reprinted in book form, to be read by a much smaller public?

A further question, which must have caused many controversies everywhere for centuries, concerns the relative competence of the censors and the authors concerned. This applies particularly to books involving historical research or specialized scholarship. There are in this country, as elsewhere, learned historians and scholars in scripture or theology whose knowledge is generally recognized to be far greater than that of others. When their books have to be submitted for censorship sympathy would seem to be more needed for the censor than the author. Yet in the case of large books it is probable that some point will be criticized or some statement challenged, on which the author is required either to provide convincing proof or to alter what he has written. The individual censor's name is not revealed until the *imprimatur* has been given, and then his name appears under the *nihil obstat*. It is his business to look for any possible error or ambiguity which might seem heretical, and his reputation in granting the *nihil obstat* is at stake even more than that of the author, who could always correct himself in a subsequent edition.

Considering all the difficulties, the system works with remarkable smoothness. It is very doubtful whether authors or publishers would wish to have it abolished, or even seriously altered. Most Catholic authors are extremely sensitive to any possible suggestion of unorthodoxy, and it is hardly conceivable that any Catholic writer would deliberately persist in writing what might

be even misunderstood in a heretical sense. For the clergy it is a most welcome protection, since they need have no further anxiety once the *imprimatur* has been granted. The responsibility thereafter is transferred to the censor who has approved the book. In practice I would say that probably three books out of four receive the *imprimatur* without the requirement of any change at all. It is certainly the exception rather than the rule, unless the book is a large and important one, to receive a note from the censor's office drawing attention to some sentence or paragraph which is thought to be misleading or untenable. The author is usually as glad as is the publisher to have his attention called to such passages in a forthcoming book; and it is usually a question of re-writing a passage more carefully, with no real disagreement between the author and the censor. In my own experience, I should say that the most frequent source of such criticisms is the excessive enthusiasm of biographers. Miracles are attributed to men or women whose canonization is hoped for; and the censor always insists on being satisfied by the evidence. In most cases the author is required to delete such sentences; and few people would quarrel with that attitude on the censor's part. Another cause of disagreement is in statements of theological doctrine, where an author may have expressed himself badly, or may have made dogmatic statements on doctrines which are undecided. I have frequently seen such criticisms by the censors, but I have very seldom known any sort of disagreement or resentment on the author's part, while in almost every case the book is improved by accepting the censor's requirements.

There are, however, certain rules which publishers, as well as authors, find irritating and unnecessary. The censors, for instance, usually insist that all scriptural quotations must be given in the Douai version. This seems quite a reasonable demand, but the difficulties it causes are surprisingly numerous. For instance, it happens that a large proportion of Catholic authors in modern England are converts who have been brought up in the Authorized Version. Even among the clergy many

such converts sometimes use the Authorized Version still, either deliberately, because the translation may be better, or unconsciously. But in the writings of scriptural scholars, this rule produces endless trouble. Some of them substitute their own translation of passages which they believe to be mistranslated. Some use whichever version appears most accurate in any passage. The publisher has usually learnt from experience that this matter should be cleared up before the book goes to the printers, and in works of scriptural research the censor usually allows an expert to use his discretion. But this rule crops up disconcertingly in connection with many classes of books. One censor recently objected to the phrase "John the Baptiser" instead of "John the Baptist", although the context gave some justification for using the less familiar word.

Another problem concerns the granting of *imprimaturs* to books by non-Catholic authors. This affects even official publications like the *Westminster Hymnal* or the English translation of the *Roman Breviary*. If a Catholic translation is available the compiler is expected to use that instead of any other translation by some non-Catholic, which may be better and also more widely known, even among Catholics. A reasonable latitude in such matters would be very helpful, and there is no reason to believe that the censors would object to granting such latitude—at any rate to responsible editors—if Rome were to reconsider the whole question in relation to existing conditions. A curious difficulty arises, for instance, in the writings of such well-known converts as Cardinal Newman or Mgr. R. H. Benson. They wrote much in their earlier years, before they became Catholics, which could be included in any Catholic list; but it would embarrass the censor to ask for an *imprimatur* for such works. In some cases an *imprimatur* has been obtained, through inadvertence, for such books; but the present rules would, so far as I can judge, prevent it.

A similar problem concerns the granting of *imprimaturs* to books by contemporary writers who are not Catholics. Suppose, for instance, that Professor Chambers had brought his fine biography of St. Thomas More to a

Catholic firm. The Catholic publisher is apparently obliged to get an *imprimatur* for a book on a Catholic subject. But the censors—at any rate in some dioceses—have made it a rule to refuse the *imprimatur* to any book by a non-Catholic. I understand that this decision resulted from the efforts of certain Anglo-Catholic writers to produce books on Catholic subjects—particularly biographies of saints—which might appeal to Catholic readers. A non-Catholic publisher might publish an extremely admirable life of, say, St. Francis of Assisi, and in the hope of attracting Catholic readers he would submit the book for an *imprimatur*. Obviously this exploitation of the Catholic *imprimatur* to help the sale of Protestant books was objectionable; and if the book contained nothing to which the censor objected the only apparent reason for refusing an *imprimatur* was to make a rule that it could not be granted to books by Protestant authors. These are rather exceptional problems, but they occur from time to time, and publishers would be glad to have the matter cleared up. The censors are usually most willing to be helpful, but they are bound by rules which would produce many anomalies if they were inflexibly applied. I may quote one more instance of such anomalies. Last year I was delighted to receive an MS. from Mr. Watkin Williams, an Anglo-Catholic clergyman and scholar of great distinction, who is recognized as a leading authority on the life and writings of St. Bernard. He had made a new translation of St. Bernard's famous sermon *De Conversione*, which is not obtainable otherwise in English. He had collated various MSS. in a new way, and the little book was to consist of a scholarly introduction, the translation and the original Latin text, with ample footnotes. I was very glad indeed to publish the book, but an *imprimatur* could not be granted because Mr. Williams is not a Catholic. I was therefore obliged to proceed without consulting the censors, feeling quite sure that they would not wish to be embarrassed by being asked whether their rules would prohibit such a publication.

I have discussed these matters in such detail because it seems fairly certain that the controversy which Mr.

Noyes has conducted with so much publicity can scarcely fail to result in a revision of the existing censorship rules. It is, I believe, the view of the censors in England that his *Voltaire* should have been submitted for censorship before publication. It would be surprising if the Holy Office does not confirm that view explicitly, since it has already expressed its displeasure with Mr. Sheed's firm for having published it. Nobody who now reads the book closely could feel surprised that the Holy Office should take that view. But the official attitude raises endless questions for Catholic authors. It is by no means unreasonable that every Catholic publisher should invoke the censorship for any book which concerns faith or morals—though, as I have mentioned, it seems fantastic that where a non-Catholic scholar writes an unimpeachable book of Catholic interest which nobody else could write so well, Catholic publishers (who are the only publishers at all likely to consider it) might strictly be forbidden to publish it because the *imprimatur* cannot be granted to a non-Catholic's work. But if a Catholic author writes for the general public, say, a historical book which involves, in some part of it, questions affecting the relations of Church and State, he could scarcely be expected to make his publisher issue the book with an *imprimatur*. The point is genuinely important, because the ordinary non-Catholic has no idea of what an *imprimatur* means, and assumes at once that the book has not been written with freedom or with frankness.

The mere sight of a *nihil obstat* printed in the front of a book gives many people the idea that it must be a devotional work. I recall one striking instance of that prejudice, which shows how very widely it persists. A few years ago Burns & Oates published a translation of Cardinal Faulhaber's famous series of sermons on "Judaism, Christianity and Germany". The book was widely reviewed and I received sympathetic inquiries from various unusual sources as to how it might be made better known. In particular a certain distinguished member of the Athenaeum Club came to visit me to ask whether certain changes might not be made in its format which he thought would make it more attractive

to the general public. What worried him particularly was that the translation (which was excellent, and the work of Canon George Smith) was published with an *imprimatur*. No ordinary Englishman, my friend assured me, would ever believe that a book which contained an *imprimatur* had not been either expurgated or written under restrictions.

It would not be too much to say that if the Holy Office were to require that every such book by a Catholic author must not only receive but must display the censor's *nihil obstat*, the relations of Catholic authors with non-Catholic publishers would be very gravely prejudiced. The publishers would regard it as a serious handicap to any new book published by them, and certainly many non-Catholic readers would regard such books with suspicion. It may be assumed that these considerations will not be overlooked if the Holy Office issues new regulations as result of the *Voltaire* controversy. It would certainly be deplorable if any impracticable regulations were issued. Catholic authors can generally be trusted to take reasonable care in avoiding any statements which conflict with Catholic teaching, and any Catholic writer who aims at writing as a Catholic apologist would be acting very foolishly if he did not obtain expert advice from the censors, whether privately or officially, before publishing a book of the kind.

Unfortunately it is impossible to conclude this consideration of the publishers' position without commenting directly upon Mr. Noyes's book. More than enough has been said already about his defiance of the Holy Office, and the astonishing method he chose of making his protest. It is quite impossible to sympathize with his impatient appeal to the Protestant public for "protection" against the Roman authorities when he had already petitioned them for a statement of the sentences or passages which have incurred disapproval. Nor can there be any sympathy with his decision to have the book republished at once in its original form, pending the arrival of the explanations which he had sought. Mr. Noyes does not even promise to withdraw every passage which he may be asked to withdraw, and

he only offers to add an appendix dealing with whatever corrections he may consider necessary.

The question which concerns every Catholic author or publisher in the future is whether the Roman authorities will require an *imprimatur* for all books affecting faith or morals, even if it is published by a "neutral publisher".

Any Catholic who now reads Mr. Noyes's book more carefully will certainly wonder, in spite of all the praise which was given to it at first by Catholic reviewers, whether an *imprimatur* could possibly be obtained for it without a very drastic revision. It is unquestionably a most one-sided book. It omits so much that was extremely characteristic of Voltaire, while exaggerating everything that can be said in defence of the author's thesis, that an ecclesiastical censor could scarcely give it an *imprimatur* without appearing to endorse the author's point of view. There is nothing new or even startling in finding that a Catholic apologist should have a good word to say for Voltaire. Mr. Algernon Cecil, in a letter to *The Times*, has pointed out that a hundred years ago Lacordaire was publicly "thanking God for Voltaire" in the pulpit of Notre Dame cathedral—on the ground that he had produced the "good gift of religious liberty" in France. But Mr. Noyes is concerned to show that Voltaire was not only no atheist, but a deeply convinced believer in God. In describing the long and complicated story of his life, Mr. Noyes almost invariably implies that the religious authorities were wrong, and that Voltaire was right, in the many controversies between them. If a Catholic author writing on these thorny subjects is required to obtain an *imprimatur* for his book—and the claim is certainly a reasonable one—is it likely that Mr. Noyes could obtain an *imprimatur* without rewriting it and giving a more balanced picture of the whole story?

It is no mere question of correcting inaccurate statements of historical fact, such as Mr. Noyes professes his readiness to correct. Any censor to whom the book was submitted would, I believe, have to consider two quite different problems. If he were required only to point

out statements which a Catholic writer should not make—because they are either offensive or untrue—he could draw up a list of them and ask that they be either modified or suppressed. For instance, on page 183, in discussing a rather pretentious statement of Voltaire's, Mr. Noyes actually writes: "There is something not only Christian, but Christ-like, in the reply of Voltaire." This statement, especially in the context, is unjustifiable and offensive. And again, on page 470, where Mr. Noyes discusses the fantastic occasion when Madame Pompadour conceived the notion that Voltaire should be made a cardinal in reward for making a new translation of the Psalms for her special benefit, Mr. Noyes sums up the incident by saying that "the laugh would not have been against himself if the mad plan had succeeded. Morally, as cardinals then went in France, Voltaire, with his sense of pity, his passion for justice, and his real belief in God, would have shone by comparison". It is hardly credible that Mr. Noyes should have written so carelessly, and he could scarcely object to even an official censor pointing out that such statements required revision. How much does he know about the cardinals of France during Voltaire's lifetime, whom he condemns so sweepingly? And is he really prepared to tell the world—in this work which he undertook to write as a contribution to Catholic apologetics—that in comparison with them Voltaire would, morally, have shone? Or, to quote another instance from page 483, Mr. Noyes actually writes as follows: "Voltaire believed in God. No man ever believed in God more firmly." Can he really not name anybody in the Church's history who "believed in God more firmly" than Voltaire? Such sentences reduce his thesis *ad absurdum*; which is surely a pity, for the thesis was well worth developing within the limits of reasonable criticism and serious scholarship.

A censorship which prevents the inclusion of such extravagance in a serious book is, by any standard, doing a service to literature. But if the censor is required to say *nihil obstat* to a work of Catholic apologetics he has a larger responsibility. Mr. Noyes carries hero-worship

to extraordinary lengths. A censor might well require that the other side of the question should also be shown. But even without requiring such revision, could he give approval to Mr. Noyes's account of many controversies concerning the Church or the Faith? Take for instance his treatment of Voltaire's skit on St. Joan of Arc, including its famous lines declaring (in Mr. Noyes's translation) that "the greatest of all her works was to keep her virginity for a whole year". Mr. Noyes treats this as one of Voltaire's little jokes, and explains that *La Pucelle* was "the lively recreation of his leisure, a burlesque amusement in which he had found relief from his more serious work". He "uses the outlines of the real story as a framework for his burlesque", and Mr. Noyes finds the skit "certainly not more scandalous than some of the tales in Chaucer, who in many ways offers the closest parallel in English".

Another problem for the censor would be the chapter which describes the condemnation and enforced withdrawal of Voltaire's *Mahomet*. One of the principal denouncers was a certain abbé Desfontaines. Mr. Noyes writes that "the abbé Desfontaines (of Sodom, as both Voltaire and Carlyle distinguish him) set a hundred dirty little hands plucking at ecclesiastical sleeves and pointing accusing fingers at Voltaire as the author of more 'veiled attacks' upon religion in general and Christianity in particular". Mr. Noyes mentions later that this abbé had been convicted of sodomy, and he has doubtless investigated all the evidence. But the fact, if it is authentic, is scarcely relevant. Equally distasteful is Mr. Noyes's account of the sequel when Voltaire desired election to the French Academy, but was opposed on the grounds that his *Mahomet* had been scandalous. The vacancy in the Academy had arisen through the death of Cardinal de Fleury in 1743. One of Voltaire's chief opponents was Bishop Boyer, formerly Bishop of Mirepoix, who had been tutor to the Dauphin. He signed himself "anc. de Mirepoix". Voltaire read this as "âne de Mirepoix" and called the bishop "the ass of Mirepoix". Mr. Noyes has a lively chapter to which he gives that title. He describes the

bishop, without attempting any justification for such abuse, as "an old imbecile", and says that "he had openly placed himself at the head of the cabal against Voltaire on the ground that it would not be decent for a cardinal to be replaced in the French Academy by a philosopher". He then describes how "finally Boyer secured a candidate in a certain abbé, who had gone into the Church after resigning from his regiment, of which he had been the Colonel. The resignation had taken place in somewhat inglorious circumstances. He had refused to 'give satisfaction in an affair of honour'." Of the facts concerning this "certain abbé" I know nothing; but from what Mr. Noyes states he was apparently a colonel who resigned his commission rather than fight a duel, and then entered the priesthood. Mr. Noyes, writing for the general public, implies that this decision was ignominious and that it was an outrage that such a person should be put forward by a French bishop for election to the Academy as a rival to Voltaire. It is a surprising passage to find in what purports to be a defence of Catholic belief. But the question immediately under discussion is whether a censor could be expected to let that pass in a book for which he is asked to give an *imprimatur*?

These passages are so glaring that while the future attitude of the censorship is under consideration there can be no unfairness to Mr. Noyes in drawing attention to them. Three English censors, it is understood, have now been ordered to consider the book carefully and report upon it. They may find many other passages which invite disapproval, in such circumstances; but these few which I have quoted almost at random must strike the least instructed reader. The question which affects all Catholic authors is whether as a result of this *Voltaire* controversy their own work is to be exposed to close scrutiny hereafter, and whether they must be expected to obtain an *imprimatur* for what they write. Could such a rule be enforced, if it is thought desirable, in a country where most successful authors will usually publish their books with non-Catholic firms? The question is a really serious matter for all Catholic authors

and publishers, and it is very much to be hoped that no decision will be taken in Rome without giving special consideration to the difficulties in a country where Catholics are still a small minority. That the ecclesiastical authorities should order the withdrawal of a book which is found to be objectionable is a proposition which no Catholic can seriously dispute. The traditional method has been an appeal to the Holy Office in Rome, and Mr. Noyes has certainly not found any considerable support in his angry objections to it. One can at least hope that the Roman authorities will not find it necessary to tighten the censorship rules, because of his book, in a way which would seriously restrict the freedom of Catholic writers and publishers.

DENIS GWYNN.

THE CHURCH IN SPAIN

AS the war drags on into a third year the significance of the operations tends to be obscured through ignorance or skilful propaganda, and the repercussions on the peace of Europe become more dangerous. Many people must wonder whether it is not possible to put an end to the struggle by some form of compromise. The Great War is so distant that it is now forgotten how the defence of Verdun almost immobilized the French during the battle of the Somme and that this battle compelled the German retreat in 1917. There are some positions which no military but every moral reason impels an army to defend, though the defence bleed them to death; and this should be borne in mind when weighing the significance of the Spanish Government's defence of its shrinking foothold across the Ebro. It is not, however, my purpose to enlarge on this point, which is unnecessary for those who are conversant with military affairs and will be appreciated by others according to *parti pris*. I have just returned from Spain after, it is quite accurate to say, a visit to both sides, since much of my time was taken up in examining territory which had only been in Nationalist hands a few months after nearly two years' occupation by the Government. And there is one aspect of Spain which had never made so much impression on me before, and appears to have escaped consideration by those who treat the possibility of a compromise seriously.

Coming to Spain after the unique experience of a visit to Lourdes, it is strange that Spain's attitude to religion should strike one so overwhelmingly. Happily, people may be seen attending Mass even here on week-days. In Lourdes the fervour is amazing, and one may have to wait in a queue for three-quarters of an hour for communion at the Grotto. But Lourdes is a place apart. In the Dublin churches on week-days packed congregations may be seen at Mass. In Nationalist Spain, almost wherever one may go there is always a considerable number of people attending Mass, and it is

remarkable how many of them carry prayer-books. In the early hours of the morning there are generally two or three Masses being said at the same time, and each will have its group of devout people who will hear the Mass and then pass to the Blessed Sacrament chapel for communion. Confessions are generally being heard at the same time at the grilles which, for women, are open and visible to all, while the men kneel on the bare stone waiting to make their confession at the priest's feet in turn. The women appear to stand quite naturally in long lines waiting, a foot or so apart, until the grille is at their disposal. This was true of every church I visited, not only of the great shrines like the Basilica of Our Lady of the Pillar, but also of the Santa Engracia and the church of St. Gil. It was true of the churches in San Sebastian and of those in Burgos; and it was most impressive. But it is impossible to visit such churches as the cathedral of La Seo, the Basilica of Our Lady and the Santa Engracia at Saragossa, the new or old cathedrals at San Sebastian, or the cathedral at Burgos, or almost any church, without receiving another much deeper impression. It might have been expected; as a fact it came as a surprise. None of these churches has the restrained severity of those one is accustomed to in England, Ireland, or even in France. The most severe and the noblest of them all, the cathedral at Burgos, fails to make its full architectural appeal since the appeal of its devotion is so much more arresting. Periods and styles which, to the fastidious, seem to clash, have found their supreme reconciliation. There is the purest thirteenth century, the Renaissance and the over-elaboration of Churriguera in the eighteenth century. But the story which they tell is one of supreme importance. Catholicism captured not only the intellect of Spain but its whole heart, its whole being; and in the churches can be read all the imagination, mysticism, poetry and colour of Spain.

If this is clear in the cathedral at Burgos it is dominant in such churches as the cathedral of La Seo. In going round the church with its multitude of chapels and its exuberant wealth of ornamentation the mind,

unbidden, leaps back to the Old Testament, to the descriptions of Solomon's Temple. The shrine of Our Lady of the Pillar stands apart. About four yards from the actual image there is a hole in the groined roof through which a bomb fell without exploding ; and a yard or two away, at the west end of the church, is the magnificent Renaissance choir. This church, too, makes the same impression ; but so does the Santa Engracia, and so does a church selected haphazard, merely as being nearest my hotel, at Burgos. In all the churches, in fact, can be seen something of Spain for which sufficient allowance has not been made. If they were merely museum pieces this would be the same, though it would not have the same bearing on the present issue. But they are not dead so much as living temples of devotion ; and there must be thousands of them in Nationalist Spain, not simply witnesses of the past, but objects of a present loving devotion.

It does not take a long time to grasp this lesson ; but if, once it is learned, one visits territory until recently in the hands of the Spanish Government, an entirely different spirit makes itself felt. Something has already been written about the cemetery of Huesca ; but the impression made is unforgettable. On the slabs which close the vaults the face of Our Lord or Our Lady was almost universally carved in relief. The Government troops who occupied the cemetery patiently chipped off every one of them. In one case, where the material seemed peculiarly resistant, someone with perverse skill had scraped out the eyes from the face of Our Lady. One tomb had been turned into a cesspool. One or two had been converted into bars. Some had been used for fireplaces. On the walls were pornographic drawings and inscriptions, now mostly obliterated by a coat of whitewash. But in a church in Lerida I saw something which is almost incredible. Apart from a few bricks, which showed where the high altar had stood, there was nothing at all to suggest it had been a church. There was not a statue, not a painting, no holy-water stoup. The church may have been shelled ; but no shell discriminates in this way. The nave was deep in filth, and

from the dirt the toe of my shoe unearthed something bright which I proceeded to dig out. It was the crown from a statue of Our Lady.

Belchite is in ruins ; but the convent there had escaped gross damage except the same ingenious destruction which had defiled the church at Lerida. It was possible to recognize that it had been a chapel, and the International Brigade who defended this little town had patiently broken open the vaults and flung out the skeletons of the nuns. Most of these have now been reinterred. Two, however, I saw. They were blackened skeletons with the arms still pressed together as in prayer. These scenes are terrible. But can one dismiss them simply in that way ? The contrast between Nationalist Spain and Government Spain is obvious and sharp. The question is, how deep does the cleavage go ? Can it be bridged ? Anyone who examines the two Spains will find it difficult to imagine any possibility of compromise. On the one hand you have a Spain in which Catholicism has taken deep root through the ages, in which it seems that Spain found its fulfilment and a field for all its generous devotion ; and on the other you have a Spain which, under the tutelage of the first State to adopt atheism openly, has bent its full energies to wipe out every trace of that same religion. Government Spain has, apparently, nothing constructive to its record. In some of the reconquered territory through which I passed the 1936 harvest had not been gathered. Until recently it had sufficient food-producing territory for its population, less wheat but more rice *per capita* than had Nationalist Spain. But the cattle were killed, the ground was never properly cultivated. It has never, in fact, fed its people. But it has succeeded in this, at least : it has simply blotted out religion. It has done even more ; it has poured every sort of contempt upon it. What ground is there here for compromise ? Señor Azaña, in the vague speech he delivered on 18 July, said at least one thing that deserves record : "This is the basis of nationality and the root of patriotic feeling. It does not consist of a dogma which excludes from nationality those who do not profess a certain

religion, political, or economic dogma. That is an Islamic conception of the nation and of the State." The words were addressed to a public beyond the boundaries of Spain. But their value can be measured by this spectacle of the holocaust of Spanish churches, Spanish priests, and of all those who dared even to wear a religious emblem.

This crime is sometimes defended as having been carried out in defiance of the Government in the first days of the revolution. When Castellon de la Plana was taken there was found a dossier which throws some light on this contention. This document, numbered 71, was drawn up by the provincial High Court of that city in the summer of 1937. It consists of 28 sheets containing 135 reports from the same number of towns, grouped into 9 dockets put together by the magistrates of the primary court and by examining magistrates. The reports of the districts of Morella and Viver were assembled by their respective magistrates, who summarized the reports sent them by the municipal authorities. The reports of the other judicial districts of the province were signed by the municipal authorities or their official secretaries, and bear their official stamps. The reports are, therefore, completely authoritative. What are these reports? From the circulars signed at Valencia on 27 October last by the Minister of Justice, Sr. Irujo, and on 11 August, 1937, by the President of the Supreme Court, and addressed to the presidents of the provincial High Courts, it is evident that the Government of the Republic endeavoured to legalize the position of fact by invoking the Law of Confessions and Religious Congregations. It is significant that in its endeavour to secure its "rake-off" for the crime, the Government chose as its collector the Catholic Minister Irujo. He ceased to be Minister of Justice shortly afterwards, and has now left the Cabinet altogether. Perhaps the irony of the situation was too much for him. At all events, it became his task to procure an inventory of all property, "edifices, estates, annexes, or objects of worship" and extract a fee for all "that could not be shown to be private property". The process of legalizing *post factum* has been a popular

expedient of all Left-wing Governments since the foundation of the Republic.

The circulars and the reports contain many sentences that deserve to be placed on record. In the circular of the President of the Supreme Court, for instance, there is a sentence which no one will feel errs by overstatement. "The violence of the first moments of the rebellion and the need caused by the struggle of the Republic against the rebels have caused the occupation for divers purposes different from their fundamental one of many of the edifices referred to." Therefore, the circular continues, it is advisable "to draw up a full catalogue" of "purely informative character" to provide a detailed "account of the edifices, estates, annexes and objects of worship" with their "state of preservation, uses, present use, and the authority or organization in whose possession they now lie". The Minister of Justice, being a Catholic, is at pains in his circular to make his defence clear: "As a sequel to the military rebellion that caused the present struggle and *in virtue of the hostile attitude to the legitimate Government adopted by a great many Church dignitaries*, that property, as is well known, was for far the most part not allowed to be used for its aforesaid ends. And, thanks to the popular reaction, *it was later the object of temporary occupation by official entities in some cases, or by merely political or syndical bodies* in most cases, who, no doubt, used such property as far as it was possible in such a way as would most benefit the common weal." "Not allowed to be used" for its original purpose is an admirable euphemism in view of what I have already said. Sr. Irujo proceeds in his circular to burn his boats. He announces that he considers the State the "sole legitimate ruler" of the property of the Church and claims in its name "to restore the fullness of the title of possession" by legalizing the usurpation, or "to revoke a situation of fact now exceeded as may be advisable in each case". It is Sr. Irujo who thus attempts to provide a legal façade for a violent robbery by invoking the law itself, forgetting the protests that its promulgation evoked from the Spanish hierarchy and the express condemnation by the Pope, who described

it as the worst of all persecuting laws of God and His Church.

The reports asked for by these circulars of the Castellon province fully confirm, even if the observed facts had failed to do so, all the reports based on previous information. Some officials were more zealous than others, but in the end all returned their reports, some with instructive individual notes. The dossier was finally ready on 11 November, 1937, and it is impossible to read the reports without becoming more convinced than ever that in Government Spain there is a spirit which is entirely alien to that of national and historic Spain. "Destroyed in the interior" (like the church at Lerida, I imagine) is a phrase which occurs repeatedly. There appears to be not a single church, chapel, calvary, or shrine which has escaped. In a very few cases there is a list of the wretched remnants saved from the mob. The Nules inventory is a case of the sort. Among the non-important objects it enumerates "a black priest's cloak", "6 stoles", "3 maniples", "4 white and one black rosary", "two badges inscribed 'Spanish Night-worshipper'." Chalices, ciboria and anything of value, either intrinsic or artistic, are conspicuous by their absence. (Some of the London dealers, however, know more about these particular objects.) In the report from the town of Eslida some objects of worship are mentioned and "it is pointed out that *all* these objects are injured because doubtless they have received blows". Not even the few saved from complete destruction or looting were of any use. The destruction was not always caused by "popular reaction", to use Sr. Irujo's phrase. The Cortes de Arenoso magistrate reports that "in this place nothing but two dozen candlesticks remain; the rest, altars, pictures and other objects without value, was destroyed, knocked down and burned when the revolution began by *militiamen who came to this town for that purpose*". The Ahin report adds its mite to the inventory: "A picture of the Crucifixion, apparently by El Greco." The reports run in the same key: all the "objects for worship" would appear to have disappeared or were destroyed or were food for the flames. The little that has been saved is useless.

How can worship be carried on without the necessary means? The Pope authorized consecration in crystal chalices; but since the revolution began until now there have been no chalices, and therefore, except by rare exception, no worship.

As to the churches themselves, the reports are very varied. The churches of Almazora, Onda, Villafames, Arrabal del Carmen, Villareal, etc., were burnt. Those of Peniscola and the Clarissan nuns of Onda were left in ruins. The following were razed to the ground: the Archpriest's church of Santa Maria, those of Santa Clara, the Grao, and the church and convent of the Capuchin nuns in Castellon—the first four by the corporation's orders and the last by the Castellon Provincial Council. The same occurred to the Borriol Calvary. Some churches were demolished with pickaxes on the excuse of town-planning. Others were walled up to prevent the public from entering. Among these were the shrines of St. Antony, St. Mary and St. Michael at Nules. Among the frankest reports is that of Villafranca del Cid, which runs: "*A Church . . . Work has been done abolishing the characteristics of worship.*" No name is given; and this is characteristic of a group of reports. Not only is the church destroyed; its very name is wiped out. The Torreblanca magistrate simply gives the position—the street and number—of the five buildings devoted to worship, leaving the identification to subsequent verification. The Eslida report writes "An Ex-Church". The Vall d'Alba document refers to the parish church as a "building formerly devoted to religious worship; today a store and shop for comestibles, seeds and manures for agriculture and fodder for cattle". That of San Jorgo writes of "a house formerly used as a church"; and the reports of Artama, Bechi, are in the same vein.

The ban upon religious names reaches a climax in Villareal. The report refers to nine buildings and, though the description is detailed, there are no data sufficient for identification. The parish church alone can be distinguished from the rest by the description given to number seven: "Another one-storey building occupying nearly a whole block in Salmeron Street, in a

fairly good state of preservation, though of ancient construction, is next to the tower or steeple of the same. In this building is an organ of some value which is intact. The building is closed." It argues some ingenuity to describe the church as an accessory to its own tower; but this detail proves that it is the parish church that is in question. In the Villareal report there also is a reference to "another one-storey building in the Carmen quarter . . . which is *somewhat ruinous owing to a fire*; it is closed today". There are many who will be interested in another extract from the same report: "A one-storey building in the Jose Flors Street in a good state of preservation. Within, on the ground, is a considerable number of books, the said heap of books must be about six metres long and one metre sixty centimetres wide by one metre fifty high which needs time and care to be put in order. The building is closed today."

Such is the state of the churches revealed by the reports. To what use are they applied today? In this direction the revolutionary imagination has had most scope. The churches are now being used as stores, union centres, garages, refuges for evacuated people, food dumps, syndical offices, collectivities stores, clubs, prisons, barracks, public offices and, not more than half a dozen altogether, schools and hospitals. The individual reports are more varied and more interesting than this broad summary. They have, moreover, the merit of revealing an aspect of life in Government Spain which is insufficiently known in this country. Although the Government has imposed a kind of working unity through the methods of the Cheka, which Mr. Orwell insists is functioning independently, the unions flourish and exercise a power that would be incredible in a civilized State. And thus it comes about that many of the churches are held by the C.N.T.-F.A.I. (the Anarchists), and the U.G.T. (the Socialists), who are only now being made to pay attention to the claims of the State. The Tornosa parish church is thus described as "attached by the Popular Front, in a good state of preservation; given for and used by the Single Union of Miscellaneous Trades—C.N.T.-F.A.I.-A.I.T., in which it holds its meetings and has installed

its Co-operative Stores". Vinaroz parish church was occupied by the Local Federation of C.N.T. Single Unions. The same Federation occupied that of San Agustin, and the Local Federation of Workers' Societies of the U.G.T. was in possession of another, San Agustin. As no doubt the harmony between the two societies was generally precarious and was likely to break down at times over the sharing out of loot, the church of San Francisco was allocated to another body with a sort of joint control: "Store of the Regional Delegation of Algarrobera of the C.N.T. and U.G.T."

In Bechi they used as a "recreation hall and offices of the local C.N.T. Union" the rectory and another building used as a shrine for religious worship called "San Antonio" which is today "working as a beehive store". Segorbe episcopal palace was "occupied by the Single Syndicate of miscellaneous Trades C.N.T. of Segorbe", and the cathedral "occupied as regards the cloister as *a store of carob beans and coal* of the production collectivity of the C.N.T.". Vall de Almonacid parish church is thus described: "Damaged inside, used as a dance hall and for other amusements, belonging to the C.N.T. Union organization". Alfon de Guilla parish church, "in perfect condition", was turned into a "public club" in possession of the U.G.T. and I.R. The Socialist and Communist parties respectively seized the chapels of the Virgin of San Roque and of Alemanara and used them for their meetings. In Fuente de la Reina and Villanueva de Viver the workers' unions did not seize the churches, which were attached and occupied by the Republican Left, who also took over the rectories and their adjoining orchards.

Sr. Irujo had reminded these high-handed people of the existence of the State and gave them the cue about turning their thefts to some purpose in its interest. The utilitarian note is, therefore, frequently sounded. Many rectories were let to private persons, such as those of Benafer, Castell de Cabres, Vinaroz and others. A field in Gucihas, belonging to Torchiva church, was "attached by the Republican Left which has let it and received the rent thereof". Similarly the parish church of San

Rafael del Rio is thus reported : "Furniture and objects of worship destroyed ; building untouched. Devoted to the service of the people, a market and food-supply stores." One church is even reported as devoted to "cultural and social work". On the other hand, there is a distinct note of grievance in some of the reports which suggest that the anarchy was at times too much for the Anarchists. Thus Almenara Holy Cave is described as a house "owned by a neighbour" ; and the Shrine in San Antonio street at Castelnuevo was "attached by the Popular Front, but without anyone's permission someone appropriated it and still has it without even paying rates, and uses it as a shed for animals".

These documents have been collected and have been seen by several English priests, at least one of whom photographed one of the circulars and several of the returns. They are now in safe keeping, but are available for consultation at Burgos. There is, therefore, no secrecy about them ; and the English priests referred to saw them almost immediately after they were discovered, before even the Ministries at Burgos knew of their existence. There is, therefore, no doubt about their authenticity ; and it is reasonable to think that this inquisition was universal since there is nothing in Castellon which would call for a special enquiry there. They are, therefore, extremely valuable as giving the complement to the scenes I myself witnessed in recently occupied territory. They suggest this at least—that the holocaust of religion has been complete, and that only a year ago was any sort of attempt made by the State to take official cognizance of a campaign which has never been surpassed in the history of the Church. When the State did take notice of what had occurred it was not to make any sort of reparation but to invest the accomplished fact with a spurious legality for a monetary consideration.

There is evidence in these documents that the campaign was organized. One is quite frank on this subject, and states in so many words that the destruction was carried out by a band of militiamen who came to the town for the purpose ; and there is much more evidence of the sort outside these provincial reports. Indeed,

destruction of the wholesale nature seen in the church at Lerida argues organization. In the statement "work has been done abolishing the characteristics of worship" there is evidence of design—is it too much to say *devilish* design? Church burnings may be spontaneous, but this deliberate removing of all that suggests the role of a building is something very different. Similarly, the deliberate ignoring of the names of the churches is evidence of cold design, like the substitution of "*salud*" for the almost universal "*adios*". Is it intolerant, is it "Islamic", to use the term of Sr. Azaña, to insist that the basis of compromise between Nationalist and Government Spain does not exist? To eradicate religion from Spain is to destroy an essential part of its fibre, to take away something which has made and makes Spain what it is; and it is for this reason that General Franco recently described the struggle as one between the spirit of the nation and that of anti-nationality. These are mutually exclusive. The suggestion that somehow the differences can be composed can only come from those who will not face or have failed to realize the factors involved. It is easy to dismiss the religious issue as unessential until one has studied the lesson of the Spanish churches. Their very walls give the lie to so easy a solution. It is easy, too, to suggest that General Franco is adopting the very "Islamic" standpoint which Sr. Azaña so nobly abjures—on paper. The mere fact that so many Anarchists, so many free-thinkers, so many Moslems existed in historic Spain is a sufficient rejoinder. It is Government Spain which was and is "Islamic", which has destroyed all opposition either open or suspected; and with that there can surely be no compromise. If it wear the face of moderation today, when complete defeat threatens, it is merely that it may take up the sword again tomorrow when it has lulled to sleep the memories of these bitter years.

The one possible solution is submission. It is this that has already brought "peace by conciliation" to so large a part of Spain already, and it is the only reasonable way by which true peace can overcome. Reconquered Spain is enjoying a true measure of well-being, and even

of the joy of life. There is no sign of the imposition of order in Nationalist Spain. It is, indeed, one of the incredible things that in revolutionary centres such as Malaga, and in places which were in comparatively recent times in open revolt, life runs smoothly with no sign of the guiding hand. One may travel miles east of Huesca, which at the beginning of the year was invested by the Government troops, without finding a single check or challenge. In this, perhaps, may be found the reason that General Franco's advance is not more rapid. Before his armies move on the reconquered territory is reorganized and given peace and order. His recognition of the value of the individual life is as notable as is the contempt for it shown by the other side. This is the best assurance that submission does not mean suppression. Over all the administrative offices are painted the words "All for the Fatherland", and the posters for the anniversary of the outbreak of the war bore the two words "Spain Free". An essential part of the content of these phrases can be seen in every Spanish church today.

HUGH BROUGHALL.

LIBERTY, AND SOME MODERN THEORIES OF THE STATE

I

TO anyone who can remember the state of political thought and belief at the end of the nineteenth century the rather pompous phrase “the inevitability of gradualness” must assume a new and sinister significance. Whigs and Tories—names which at any rate seemed to betoken live human beings—had disappeared; they had been succeeded by Liberals and Conservatives. The polysyllables suggest measures rather than men, abstractions, a different way of looking at the same problem. And the problem was the rise of democracy. “We must educate our masters” was a Whig saying, but the lesson of its grim humour was not lost on the Tory party. Liberals and Conservatives set to work to educate the people; both sides accepted as a fact that for the future the people were their masters. A new word, “liberty”, slipped into the currency of Parliamentary oratory and a new phrase, “a free and enlightened people”, seldom failed to find a place in political perorations. We were, rather self-consciously, leading the world, and the words and deeds of Continental politicians encouraged us in the belief that the nations of Europe were, more or less closely, following in our wake.

Little more than thirty years have passed and yet the course of one generation has been long enough for the capsizing of our political theories, and the complete abandonment of the democratic ideal by large numbers of people has gradually come to seem an inevitable result of political progress. What has happened to the idea of liberty? It was there, a Christian concept, long before the politicians recognized it and adopted it. Where does it stand now? It is the aim of this paper to rescue the word “liberty” from those politicians who first courted it and now flout it, and to restate in plain and untechnical language its Christian meaning.

I will start then by considering the idea of liberty,

observe how liberty functions, particularly as conditioned and limited by Law, human and divine, and so to my conclusion, which is that liberty is an essential note of Christianity, because Christianity can never use men as a means but must always consider them as an end, and, therefore, since men were created by God as free rational beings, Christianity can never countenance the taking away of human liberty—or, as perhaps the Scholastics would prefer to express it—the coercion of human reason.

Liberty is the greatest and most astounding gift that Almighty God has given to man. When I call it the greatest gift I am speaking, of course, in the natural order, comparing it with the other qualities and attributes of the human mind ; and when I call it the most astounding I am speaking, as I said, in untechnical language to describe our natural astonishment that God has given us freedom. For there is this difference between the other gifts of God and this gift of liberty ; the former bring us nearer to that perfectability of our nature that God desires for his creatures ; whereas by the gift of free-will God would seem to have limited Himself and handed over to us the power, if we so will, of spoiling His handiwork and defeating His purpose. The theologians can resolve this paradox ; I am only trying to describe it as it appears to the untrained mind unversed in metaphysical reasoning.

Yet when the theologian has had his say there still remains the mystery why God has given man this freedom which carries with it the awful possibility that he may lose his soul. The nearest approach, I suppose, that we can get to a satisfactory explanation is to be found in the fact that God has made man to love Him, that love cannot be forced but must by its very nature be the act of a free and intelligent being. But whatever be the explanation we must place the gift of liberty among the highest, the most necessary and inalienable gifts of God, for if it were not so we cannot imagine that God would have endowed us with such an overwhelmingly grave responsibility.

This then is our starting-point—the immense importance in the Divine economy of man's liberty. If Almighty God can, so to say, afford to give man his liberty

even at the risk of imperilling his eternal happiness and the happiness of others, then it should be clear that man himself, whether acting as an individual or in a corporate capacity of Church or State, can view the prospect of curtailing other men's liberty in no lighthearted spirit. Law, indeed, there must be, and liberty is not licence. In practical affairs between the religious, political and economic liberty of the individual and the religious, political and economic claims of society there will be constant strife. There is no fixed line of demarcation between the two ; nor can there be, for like the constant ebb and flow of the tides the ever-changing circumstances of age, of education, of the problems of safety and survival, will necessitate and justify encroachments on personal liberty that at other times would be rightly resisted and repelled. We shall not be like the foolish courtiers of King Canute and think we can choose a spot in this debated foreshore where we can enthrone personal liberty and say to society, "Thus far and no farther"—the waves will engulf us. Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of American Independence wrote: "We hold these truths to be self-evident . . . that all men are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights ; that among them are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". There are times when these rights have to be sacrificed or curtailed in the presence of evil or for the attainment of a higher common good ; but when the crisis has passed and the tide has ebbed these rights will resume their ancient force and sanction.

It is important before choosing one among the many definitions of liberty to stress the fact that no boundary-line between liberty and coercion can be fixed that shall be, at all times, for all persons, and in all circumstances, valid and unchangeable. It is better to regard liberty as a right inherent in every human being which has to be trained, disciplined and cultivated until it develops and expands into the full, free acceptance of the highest good because such is the Will of God, man's Creator and his end. Such a way of approaching our subject will have two advantages : it will prevent us from adopting a theory of liberty that will need in practice to be hedged

about with innumerable exceptions and qualifications, and it will keep before us the notion of liberty as a desirable and attainable ideal, thus freeing us from the danger of imagining that we can ensure liberty by first destroying it. We are predisposed to this erroneous opinion by a common experience. Liberty is presented to our youthful minds as something that is constantly being limited and denied by our masters and pastors, and it is some time before we recognize the truth that all such temporary restriction of liberty is never an end in itself but is solely designed to train the subject for the proper use of his freedom. All discipline is a means to an end, and an imposed discipline that does not in the long run merge into self-discipline is a failure. Character is the outcome of self-discipline, and the standard of moral education in any educational establishment can be measured by the extent to which imposed discipline has become unnecessary.

This connection between liberty and reason is really fundamental. To talk, as some people do, as though liberty implied freedom from the rules of reason and morality is to disintegrate the moral unity of man. Since the fact that man *feels* that he is a free agent is recognized as a valid argument for the existence of free-will, the converse of the argument may surely be given weight —namely, that no man feels it as an affront to his sense of liberty that there is intellectual compulsion, or moral compulsion arising from conscience. There is no sense of constraint in accepting the mathematical fact that $2 + 2 = 4$. Similarly there is no sense of constraint in accepting the implications of a moral obligation so long as we understand and accept the terms of the proposition. I know there is a type of argument sometimes used to expose the absurdities of so-called free-thinkers, but it is a thoroughly bad type liable to do as much harm to the user as to the person it is used against. It is rather surprising to find such an acute thinker as the late G. K. Chesterton employing it against Dr. Coulton in a debate on this very subject of personal liberty. Chesterton made great play with the fact that on a hot and dusty afternoon he was not at liberty to slake his thirst at an English inn

during closing hours. Dr. Coulton retorted that no doubt Chesterton experienced the same thwarted feelings when he was forbidden to slake his thirst for knowledge by reading the books on the *Index*. I do not know Dr. Coulton's habits sufficiently well to be certain, but I hazard the guess that he did not consider that the licensing laws had destroyed his liberty any more than Chesterton thought that his liberty was impaired by the prohibitions of the *Index*. Both had voluntarily accepted certain premises of which the *Index Expurgatorius* and the licensing laws were rational conclusions. It is surely obvious that a discussion on these lines can only end in a wrangle, yet it is necessary to expose its futility since we find that debates between the supporters of dictatorship and the upholders of democracy almost invariably take this course. How many times, I wonder, have we heard the statement that there is just as much restriction of personal freedom under a democratic régime as in a totalitarian State! What are we expected to conclude from such a statement? Actually there is only one inference that can with certainty be drawn, and it is that anyone who uses such an argument has never taken the trouble to ask himself what he means by the word "liberty".

As we approach this task of defining liberty the difficulty that confronts us is at once obvious and formidable; it may be put in one word, Law. The difficulty has been realized by all the philosophers who have treated the subject. That the rival claims of liberty and law must be reconciled is a basic need of Catholic philosophy, for we cannot accept, on the one hand, the doctrines of the philosophic anarchists, and on the other hand we are bound to maintain our right to the freedom with which our Creator has endowed us. In recent times liberty has not been a popular word among Catholic theologians and moralists, due in great measure to the ill-fame the word has contracted from the errors of Liberalism. Yet St. Paul did not scruple to speak of the freedom with which Christ has made us free; and in another place he speaks of our "reasonable service", by which he obviously means the service of a free and intelligent being. This idea of

reasonableness informs and qualifies the notion of liberty in the writings of the Fathers, and rightly so, since the concept of Reason gives full value to the claims of Law which are apt to be minimized, and even obscured, by those who invoke the name of Liberty in order to free themselves from the irksomeness of discipline. Liberty, then, is a dangerous word, hedged about with difficulties, yet Leo XIII called it the "highest of natural endowments, being the portion only of intellectual and rational creatures", and he adds, "it confers on man this dignity—that he is *in the hand of his counsel* and has power over his actions". All the more reason, therefore, that we should approach it with reverence and endeavour to preserve it from those who would prostitute its uses to evil courses. It is imperative that we should not be so frightened of it that we consent to abandon it to those who would use it against all law, human and divine.

In point of fact all serious philosophers, even those who would most willingly invoke it against the claims of religion, of dogma and of the teaching Church, have recognized the central paradox—that liberty must be limited by Law or it destroys itself. John Stuart Mill, for instance, makes large claims for his doctrine of Civil Liberty.

He says that the principle is "that the sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively, in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not sufficient warrant." Though Mill would extend the domain of personal liberty farther perhaps than most of us would allow, it is still evident from the above extract that he puts a limit to it and that limit is the good of others.

More to our purpose, however, is Montesquieu's definition which I translate thus: "Liberty is the right to do that which the laws do not forbid; for if the citizen were able to do that which they forbid, it would no longer be liberty, because others would have the same

power." Here we get straightway at the central paradox, that liberty to be effective and worth while must in its own interests be constrained. By whom? There are plenty of claimants for the honour of ruling men for their own good, and they are not necessarily tyrants or megalomaniacs because they are prepared to assume the responsibility. It is easy to devise a set of rules or a code of laws which if observed by the community would immeasurably increase the general welfare. That is the first and most obvious temptation of the beneficent dictator. Liberty would stand in his way? Then so much the worse for liberty. The impatient reformer, seeing his goal, takes the short cut, trampling on whatever liberties lie in his path. The Communist and the Fascist have succumbed to this temptation because they see the advantages that will accrue from resolute action and the evils that hesitation and delay entail. If liberty is for sale the dictator can give you the highest price for it.

But it must not be supposed that the dictator has nothing in his hands but a bribe; he has arguments too, and they derive from the errors and weaknesses of Liberalism. Nineteenth-century Liberalism was a gigantic assumption that the agnostic philosophers managed to foist on a world too preoccupied with money-making to examine the grounds of the assumption. It had no solid ground; it was an elaborate structure built on sand, and in the general turmoil the foundations have been washed away. If ever the ideal of liberty (which is the foundation of political democracy and economic freedom) is to be reconstructed it must have a fixed point outside itself on which to rest. It cannot remain, as Liberalism conceived it, suspended in mid-air. The only stability that it can attain must be sought in a fundamental truth that is independent of man's shifting inclinations. Liberalism stoutly refused to see any such anchorage in the objective truth of a revealed religion. It argued that to admit such a claim was to hand over man's liberty to the custodians of ecclesiasticism. There is no point in denying that as a society composed of human beings the Church has from time to time succumbed to the temptation to coerce men's minds. The point to be

stressed is that the Church, as a divine society, is the principal if not the only witness to the fact that Almighty God has given to man the largest share of liberty far in excess of what man is prepared to concede to his fellows. As Montesquieu pointed out, to demand full liberty for one is to destroy it for others. Where, then, is the key to resolve this paradox? Undoubtedly in the recognition of the fact that God made man to serve Him and yet made him free, at least in time, to serve or to rebel. This twofold truth indicates quite clearly man's path of duty, and at the same time discourages, by Divine example, the force that would endeavour to coerce him. As we have seen in the sphere of education, an imposed discipline is no true substitute for self-discipline, so in the sphere of politics no amount of good government is any true substitute for self-government.

I sum up this part of my article in the following assertions: Liberty is a gift of God, "the highest of natural endowments"; it must, however, be used in accordance with the dictates of reason and the precepts of law; between liberty and law, therefore, there will be constant stress, and we look to the Catholic Church to maintain equilibrium between the inalienable rights of personal liberty and the legitimate demands of law. How far this balance is affected by certain modern theories of government it is the purpose of the second part of this paper to examine.

II

It is not remarkable that history has a way of repeating itself; it would be more remarkable if it did not. The causes that have divided Europe in the past are in essentials the same causes that separate Europeans into two armed camps today. They are, religion, economics, and disputes about the right to govern. We think of Europe as being torn between two theories of government, Fascism and Communism. Because the names are new we are apt to think that the alternative placed before us is a novel choice. In a sense it is, but the underlying

motives are the same that in the past produced the wars of religion, the wars of conquest, and the wars of personal ascendancy. And it is dangerously easy to over-simplify the position. There are not two politically compact ideologies in opposition ; there are at least four. Besides Communism and Fascism we have to take account of the Liberal democracies and the Catholic Church, and in these four systems there is a complicated criss-cross of opinions and ideals that we must needs unravel if we are to assess correctly their influence on the fight for liberty.

The battle that raged round religion is no longer an inter-denominational quarrel ; it is much more fundamental ; it is a direct challenge to religion itself. The question is not what form of religion is right, but whether a supernatural basis is necessary to human happiness, whether or no man can "live by bread alone". In like manner, dealing with economics, it is not merely an old-fashioned fight between the "haves" and the "havenots" (though that, of course, will always remain a powerful incentive), but the emergence of a new theory which proposes to deprive individuals of their possessions in order to enrich the community—that seems as good a definition of Communism as we can get. And lastly, the struggle is not, as formerly, one nation against another, but a struggle between the idea of racialism and the idea of internationalism.

With these three threads in our hand—religion, economics and political power—let us see where they lead us among the four groups we have mentioned. In regard to religion the attitude of the Russian Soviet is as clear as the attitude of the Catholic Church. But what of the Fascist States ? In Germany the National-Socialist Party declared in 1920 : "We demand the liberty of all religious confessions in the State, so far as they do not imperil its stability or offend against the sentiments of the German race in matters of social ethics and private morality." It is quite clear now that the operative clause in that sentence is "so far as they do not imperil its stability". When the totalitarian State begins to feel its feet and to be sure of itself it is likely to issue a new commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods but me." Indeed, it is daily

becoming more clear that the essential note of Germanic Nazism is the deification of the German Race. The refrain that appears again and again in Nazi oratory proves it : "Nations and individuals will die ; the German Race is eternal." Italian Fascism is different ; it does not fly so high. It seems at present to aim at a resurrection of Imperial Rome, a natural and possible ambition, and therefore it is possible to make terms with it, and as we know terms have been made with it, but we cannot resist the fear that they will be imperial terms. Among the democracies religion has to a great extent ceased to be a matter of concern to the Governments and its defence has been left to individual consciences.

When we come to consider our four groups in relation to economics the confusion becomes almost inextricable. The Catholic Church, the upholder of spiritual values and other-worldliness, defends private property and yet is the only group in which real Communism has been successful. The Liberal Democracies are loth to abandon *laissez-faire* because of the fat prizes it can dangle before the eyes of the avaricious. Russia, Communist in theory, has to make terms with Capitalism even inside its own country. Fascism and National-Socialism, in theory anti-Communist, are in many of their economic practices indistinguishable from it. We cannot draw a straight line and divide these forces into two camps ; we cannot even draw a line round each one of the four groups, and this inability to define an economic boundary is, I think, the main reason why we so frequently find ourselves in such embarrassing company, and explains why the working-classes, who owe so much to the Catholic Church, are generally to be found fighting against her instead of with her. The social and economic teaching of the Encyclicals is, if taken in its entirety, as abhorrent to the Capitalist and financier as any form of Socialism. But the Capitalist has seen that at the very centre of the Church's teaching is the right to possess private property. That is enough for him ; grant him but that and he will back his brains aided by our greed and avarice to turn the Church's doctrine to his own advantage and to ensure that nothing further will be heard about the really revolutionary

proposals of the *Rerum Novarum* and the *Quadragesimo Anno*.

Do not let us imagine that the working-classes have not seen that. They have seen it ; unfortunately they have not seen through it to that financiers' conspiracy by which the papal encyclicals are never referred to as the "Working-Man's Charter" but are used solely to bludgeon Socialism and defend Capitalism. That the encyclicals can be used as a basis of economic reform is proved by the experiment in Portugal, if we may believe Mr. Michael Derrick's account*—and there is no factual reason why we should not believe him, though Dr. Salazar by himself is a weak argument against those who can point to Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin, Metaxas and Kemal Attaturk. No doubt such misunderstandings and half-truths are inevitable in presenting a philosophy of life to whole nations and peoples ; no doubt the misunderstandings are fostered and exaggerated by militant Communists who are striving to detach the proletariat from the Church and embitter the common people against her. This is not the place to discuss the rights and wrongs of the anti-religious prejudice, though its presence should be noted and its source indicated.

We come to the third cause of confusion, the debate about forms of government, or political ideologies, as they are called. As Catholics we are not constrained or advised to prefer one form of government to another. The Church's teaching on this point has been definitely and finally laid down in the encyclical *Libertas Praestantissimum*. There Leo XIII said : "Of the various forms of government the Church does not reject any that are fitted to procure the welfare of the subject : she wishes only—and this Nature itself requires—that they should be constituted without involving wrong to anyone, and especially without violating the rights of the Church." This indifference to particular forms accurately reflects the attitude towards political systems of our Divine Lord, Who on the one occasion when the Jews tried to entangle Him in a political discussion dismissed the matter with almost contemptuous

* *The Portugal of Salazar*, by Michael Derrick.

indifference. And we may note that the Pope's phrase "without involving wrong to others" is translating the thought of Montesquieu into other words.

We may therefore elaborate the teaching of Leo XIII in this wise: If a nation elects to be governed by an absolute monarch, or by a republican parliament, or by a dictator, the Church will have nothing to say against it, provided it fulfils the three conditions required by Leo XIII. It would seem, then, that if those three conditions are present we as Catholics are debarred from invoking the authority of the Church either for our preferences or our criticisms. At the same time it will be noticed that the Pope's words envisage a government *in being*. He does not discuss the historical basis of government at all. That is the point that must interest us at the present juncture. By what right or authority is one form of government preferred before another? In whom does that right rest? The Church does not claim it. Then in whom does it reside? Does the right rest on some form of democracy, in other words, does it rest on the consent of the governed? We shall ask these questions in vain from the dictators, but we may press for an answer from the Communists, who say that they are the defenders of democracy, and from the Nazi and Fascist sympathisers in our midst who are perpetually seesawing between violent attacks on democratic ideals and the claim that only the totalitarian States are really democratic. It is curious to observe, amongst the dictators, how anxious they are to support themselves with the outward show of democracy; the Russian elections and the German plebiscites are cases in point. What possible reason can there be for holding these so-called elections if not to show to the world and to the nations themselves that their Governments rest on the consent of the governed? Yet the manner of these elections as compared with the way elections are conducted in democratic countries is proof that we are not speaking the same language. We are forced to realize that there is a clash of ideologies which goes to the very root or basis of government.

Democracy and totalitarianism are words that have

already gathered round them associations of bias and prejudice. Let us give them names that have not, as yet, these associations. Let us define them, clumsily, perhaps, but accurately, as the States of discussion, and the States of a uniform movement of thought. The States of discussion rely on the free play of reason ; it is the conflict between reason and anti-reason. Their enemies accuse them of fostering a legalized form of standing civil war. "It is civil war, the peaceable civil war of ideas ; and in the realm of reason such civil war is peace, the tranquillity of minds engaged in the due exercise of their faculties. To keep alive the reasoning play of our individual minds (and where else does reason reside ?) is the great thing to which we are called. . . . The great thing is that we should govern ourselves in the light and fairly put our minds to one another. The single party, the single movement, retreats into the depths of the unconscious. It weds the unconscious instinct of the led to the unconscious intuition of the leader. It conjures up masses and magnitudes unknown to sober thought, but accepted none the less as the objects of an absorbed and absorbing loyalty."*

How then do these two ideologies, the ideology of the States of discussion and the ideology of the States of single party, react to the notion of liberty ? There are three kinds ; or rather I should say there are three aspects of liberty—political liberty, economic liberty and religious liberty. I should say that I have my political liberty when I possess the power to express, fearlessly and openly, my disagreement with the acts and policies of the government in power, and the freedom to endeavour to bring other of my fellow-subjects to my way of thinking by means of free and open debate. This freedom will be conditioned and limited by the dictates of the divine and natural law, and may be further limited by the government in times of crisis and emergency. But in normal circumstances I must be free to discuss and debate the actions of government. It has been said that the safeguard of liberty is eternal vigilance, but vigilance by itself is useless unless there is granted the opportunity of free debate. A political opposition is a necessity of political liberty ; it

* *The Citizen's Choice*, by Ernest Barker.

can, of course be abused, but so can all liberty, and the possibility of its abuse, like the possibility of sin, should not be adduced (as it so very often is) as an argument for the destruction of liberty.

Economic liberty depends on the power to acquire and possess personal property so that the individual may be free to choose the way he proposes to earn his livelihood and to sell his labour or the fruit of his labour in a free and open market. Obviously this freedom will also be restricted, in addition to the limitations set by the moral law, by the capabilities of the individual and the general economic state of the country. But though there may be wide differences of opinion as to the degree of economic liberty that is consonant with the dignity of man, there is a very clearly marked line that separates the free labourer from the wage-slave, and it depends not on wealth, or status, or standard of living, but on the power of the individual to agree, or to refuse, to work at a given job. To live a man must eat ; to eat he must work : if the choice of work is decided by another, whether it be the State, or the municipality, or a person, and no matter whether he be paid a thousand a year or a pittance, he is a wage-slave. If he can make his own choice he is economically a free agent ; he can lawfully acquire and lawfully retain goods and property that are personal to himself and safeguard his liberty.

To my mind this is the overwhelming argument against Communism. But in order that it shall be effective we must be all agreed on the necessity of personal liberty as a natural prerogative of man. If we ourselves have no respect for liberty and the dignity of a free man, the argument in our hands is useless. If we place before him two alternatives both of which entail the abandonment of his personal liberty he will choose (as he is choosing in ever-increasing numbers) the alternative that seems to promise him the quickest and most desirable return, the immediate and certain satisfaction of his material needs.

We come now to the last, and I need not add the most important aspect of liberty, religious liberty. It may be defined as the right to worship God in the way that He

has appointed for us and to preach our faith and morality to others. The fact that we possess a divinely revealed religion makes it difficult for us Catholics to contemplate the granting of religious liberty to other allegiances without appearing to be disloyal to our own faith, and this difficulty has been exploited to the full by our opponents for controversial reasons. Many non-Catholics (and perhaps some Catholics) still think the Church would be a persecuting Church if she regained her former power. Yet Catholic teaching has always held that no one may be compelled by force to enter the Catholic Church ; the scrupulous care with which she has always observed this attitude is a proof. It is true, her treatment of the heretic has been different, but by definition the heretic is one who has known truth and wilfully abandoned it, in itself a moral guilt just as worthy of punishment as the violation of a civil law. Indeed, the Church handed over the heretic to the secular arm for punishment not in order to escape the odium of persecution but to show that though the offence was spiritual the *reasons* for punishing the guilty were civil reasons because of the ill effects to society. The fact that the Church envisages the co-operation of the secular power in defence of truth must make it a matter of supreme importance to her that she shall have some means of influencing that opinion. There is the real danger-spot in the totalitarian State. In the States of discussion she may be defeated, but she has always her remedy in the opportunities of converting public opinion. It is difficult to see how a totalitarian State could allow within its orbit an organization that might at any moment challenge its authority.

We cannot conclude a survey of liberty in the modern world without mentioning the most dangerous threat to its continued existence, the creation and manipulation of a mass-psychology. There are material and technical reasons for this new development : larger masses of people living in closer contact than ever before, easier and quicker communications, and greater facilities by means of the Press and the radio for influencing mass opinion. The effects of mass-psychology are not confined to the totalitarian States, but obviously they will be much

greater when controlled by a censored Press and a censored wireless. There will be few to dispute the statement that the creation of mass-psychology is the principal cause of the state of terror in which we live. Everyone detests war, everyone fears it—and everyone expects it and is preparing for it. That is due to the manipulation of mass-psychology, the very opposite of Christian teaching, which is the appeal to the individual man. We are constantly being told that improvement can only come from a change of heart—it is significant that the word is in the singular.

But if Christian teaching is to have effect in the modern world, we, as Christians and Catholics, must follow it absolutely and shape our course according to its leading, cost what it may. Power politics is no part of the Christian dynamic, and we must resolutely put behind us the glittering temptation to coerce the people even for the people's good. We cannot afford to compromise; some Catholic writers seem to think that we cannot afford *not* to compromise. One recently wrote: "There must be a resolute opposition to the steady stream of propaganda in favour of classifying countries by their forms of government, of cheerfully ranging countries as our enemies which really desire good relations."* That certainly sounds on the surface wise and moderate advice. But examine it a little more closely! Does the writer intend to take his own advice in the case of Russia and deprecate any reference to the utter denial of liberty in that country? I sincerely hope not. And then the point about the "desire for good relations". We are at present engaged in a nightmare fever of preparation against bombs, gas and incendiarism. From what countries do we expect these attacks? There is no need to answer the question; it is provided in the weekly boasts of the dictators with their glorification of the power of arms and their "forests of bayonets and aeroplanes that darken the sky".†

* *The Tablet*, April 9, 1938.

† I have never been able to understand how the Italophil Press manages to stomach such rodomontade. "We have the men, we have the ships, we have the money too" is condemned (in my opinion quite rightly) as nauseating jingoism, but stomachs are not so queasy over foreign dishes.

Our ineluctable difficulty is that we have to tread a *via media*. Private property is the basis of Capitalism, and we have to uphold the right to private property and still bear witness against the evils of Capitalism. Liberty is the basis of Liberalism, and we have to insist on liberty and condemn Liberalism. Authority is the basis of totalitarianism, and we have to support law and order and guard the liberty of the individual. There is maintained in certain sections of the Catholic Press a steady pressure to induce us to align ourselves with Fascism because Fascism is fighting Communism. To follow that advice would be to allow the Communists to parade as the defenders and upholders of democracy. I cannot imagine anything more fantastic or more dangerous. It is just what the Communists want. It strikes from our hand the one weapon we have got against them and delivers us bound hand and foot to the Moscow atheists. Imagine allowing the blood-soaked tyrants of Russia to pose as the defenders of liberty! The one hope we have of retaining the democracies (I presume we want to do that) is to prove to them that the most anti-democratic force in the world today is the Russian Soviet.

Fascism and Nazism are indeed fighting Communism—but not with the weapons of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church has never attempted to convert the world by force. Force is a result of fear—fear of the strength of one's enemies, fear for the weakness of one's own cause. It may, indeed, be said that the Catholic Church has no mission to convert the world. Her mission, divinely given, was to teach—to teach, to persuade, to convince. Peter in his fear had recourse to force, and he cut off the hearing apparatus of his opponent, thus destroying his only chance of being an effective teacher. As it was then so it is now. "He that heareth you heareth Me"—the appeal is to the reason of a free rational being; "and he that despiseth you"—there is no threat of bombs and bayonets, gas and guns—"he despiseth Me". That is all; we have done our part; the rest is with God.

S. J. GOSLING.

"A TRAGIC MISAPPREHENSION"

"**O LIBERTE, comme on t'a joué!**" (1) These, the last words of Madame Roland, were addressed to the new statue of Liberty which overlooked the platform of the guillotine on which she was to die. "O Liberty, how you have been fooled!" As a leader of the intelligentsia which had preached revolution, as the "soul of the Gironde", as the implacable enemy of poor Marie-Antoinette, Madame Roland had played a great part in the fooling of liberty—and herself.

There would be no great revolutionary movements if there were no intellectuals to crystallize and give expression to the formless resentment of the masses. Revolutions are never made from below, but the intellectuals who inspire them soon lose control of the movements which they provoke, and perish as the victims of the mob fury which they have unchained. Intellectuals who work for and welcome revolutionary movements are naive enough to believe that scientists and artists will be the residuary legatees of movements professedly engineered in the interests of the proletariat. They are soon undeceived, for the aristocracy of intellect follows to the guillotine the aristocracies of birth and of wealth. "Science", said Robespierre, "is aristocratic. The Republic has no need of savants." And he sent Lavoisier, the greatest chemist of the age, to the guillotine. Nowhere has the persecution of scientists and intellectuals been more thorough and more bitter than in Soviet Russia. The Spanish Reds have destroyed with impartial enthusiasm churches, libraries and observatories. Leningrad and Madrid echo down the ages the disillusioned cry of the disillusioned intellectual, "O Liberty, how you have been fooled!"

Marañon, one of the greatest of Spanish scientists, a leader of the Revolution which drove the King from his throne, was imprisoned under the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, but was more fortunate than Madame Roland, for he escaped from the Terror which was the inevitable consequence of the subversive movement which he had helped to create.

I have been misled [he wrote], I have been mistaken. Save for a few new-fangled Catholics who persist in their prejudice in favour of the Communists, all the intellectuals of Spain think as I do, speak as I do, and, like me, have had to flee from Republican Spain to save their lives. From the standpoint of a scientist one should recognize one's mistakes. *Peccavi!* The Revolution was brought about by us. We desired it and prepared it. . . . At bottom only one thing matters ; and that is that Spain, Europe, and mankind should be freed from a system of bloodshed, an institution of murder, the advent of which we accuse ourselves of having prepared while labouring under a tragic misapprehension." (2)

There is a recurring pattern which runs through all great revolutionary movements, a pattern which is invisible to those intellectuals who live in a dream world divorced from history. "Those who cannot remember the past", said Santyana, "are condemned to repeat it." Intellectuals in Russia and in Spain who could not remember the fate of their predecessors in France were too often condemned to repeat their tragedies. Every revolution has numbered among its architects disinterested idealists in revolt against the abuses of a system which the revolution seeks to destroy, but the most powerful and most constant factor in that complex of interests which keeps revolutions in being is the resentment and envy of those who are condemned by nature to inescapable inferiority. Subversive leaders encourage the illusion of those condemned by nature to inferiority by the hope of a Utopia in which all inequalities will be levelled out. They conceal from their dupes the melancholy fact that everything which tends to even out the accidental advantages of birth or fortune only throws into sharper relief the inequalities of natural endowment, inequalities which are not basically affected by schemes for the physical and educational development of the proletariat. Property can be redistributed, but no revolutionary tribunal can redistribute the birthrights of brains, of physique or of charm. Nature, that incurable reactionary, persists in awarding her prizes to the aristocrats of her own selection.

The inequalities of nature are more bitterly resented than those which society has the power to redress. The

envy of the rich and well born is less bitter than the envy of those whom nature has generously endowed with brains, personality or charm. Admittedly envy is not universal either among the poor or the stupid ; if it were, revolutions would be more frequent. Religion, described by Marx as the opium of the people, helps to allay the resentment which revolutionaries exploit. The hope of a reward infinitely greater than any which Nature or Society can bestow, and the knowledge that the values of this world are ephemeral, help men to endure with resignation the injustice and inequalities of the social order, and therefore those whose hope of power is derived from the sullen hatred of inequality among men condemned by Nature to inferiority resent the influence of those who preach the possibility of redress in the world to come. The reluctant realization that natural endowment can never be equalized is responsible for the demand that rewards shall be equalized. Hence the famous Communist slogan : "To every man according to his needs." It is easy to understand the appeal of this principle to those whose needs are great and whose unaided power of satisfying those needs is extremely small.

Shakespeare gave us in Jack Cade a study of a type of which the world of Shakespeare had little experience, but which the modern world knows all too well. Shakespeare, with the insight of genius, divined that the true subversive hates the cultured even more intensely than he hates the rich or well born. Compulsory equality is the theme of Jack Cade's appeal. "All the realm," he tells his followers, "shall be in common. . . . There shall be no money ; all shall eat and drink on my score ; and I will apparel them all in one livery that they may agree like brothers." *One livery* . . . one uniform for the mind, no less than for the body. A clerk who confesses that he can read and write is brought to judgement and condemned to be hanged "with his pen and ink horn about his neck". Cade is the prototype of all who wage war not only on the present but on the past. "Away," he cries to the mob, "burn all the records of the realm. My mouth shall be the parliament of England." The spirit of Jack

Cade lived on in the mob leaders who inspired the burning of the archives and libraries in Paris and in Oviedo.

In the French Revolution the King and the aristocracy were the first to suffer, but the demand for equality was not so easily sated. "The virtue of the Holy Guillotine," exclaimed Hébert, "will gradually deliver the Republic from the rich, the bourgeois, the spies, the fat farmers and the worthy tradesmen, as well as from the priests and aristocrats. They are all devourers of men." (3) Hébert omitted scientists from his list; but Robespierre, as we have seen, repaired this omission. During the destruction of Lyons, orators incited the mob to violence with an appeal to "sublime equality." Equality was declared to be "the vigorous principle of a warrior people to whom commerce and art should be unnecessary". Like Jack Cade, Robespierre had a distrust of education. "All highly educated men were persecuted," said Fourcroy to the Convention; "it was enough to have some knowledge, to be a man of letters, in order to be arrested as an aristocrat. . . . Robespierre . . . with atrocious skill, rent, calumniated . . . all those who had given themselves up to great studies, all those who possessed wide knowledge . . . he felt that no educated man would ever bend the knee to him." (4)

Aristocracy, like a malignant weed, reappeared in unsuspected places long after it had been uprooted from its normal habitats. "Nowhere", says Taine, "are there so many suspects as amongst the people; the shop, the farm, and the workshops contain more aristocrats than the presbytery or the château. In fact, according to the Jacobins, the cultivators are nearly all aristocrats; all the tradesmen are essentially counter-revolutionary . . . the butchers and bakers . . . are of an insufferable aristocracy." (5) The famous conspiracy of Babeuf, the last flickering outburst of the dying Terror, carried to its logical conclusion the creed of compulsory equality. The possessing classes were to be exterminated, and even intellectual differences were to be discouraged in the reformed education lest "men might devote themselves to sciences and thereby grow vain and averse to manual labour". Equality, social, financial and intellectual, was

the goal. "Perish if necessary all the arts provided that real equality is left us." (6) We may regard Babeuf as an irresponsible lunatic, but it would be foolish on that account to underestimate his immense influence on the revolutionary movement. The Third International in its first manifesto acclaimed him as one of its spiritual fathers.

Babeuf's philosophy has been adopted with enthusiasm by the Anarchists in Spain. Marañon, whose *mea culpa* has been quoted above, speaks with horror of the "frenzied primitives who hate all science and intellect". To the true subversive the creations of the intellect are as detestable as the intellectuals who created them. A noble painting, a great observatory or a historic library are symbols of that aristocracy of the mind which the "frenzied primitive" detests. In the French Revolution proposals were brought forward to demolish Porte Saint-Denis, to destroy the rare animals in the Museum of Natural History, and to burn the Bibliothèque Nationale. This last-named suggestion was endorsed by those who urged that all libraries should be burnt, for "only the history of the Revolution and its law will be needed". Fortunately the France of Robespierre was still living on the capital of a great cultural tradition. The inherited spirit of reverence for noble art proved stronger than the new-born lust of destruction. It is instructive to contrast the immature Communism of 1792 with the maturer Communism of 1871. For three months after Paris surrendered to the Germans the capital was ruled by the "frenzied primitives" of the Commune who destroyed and burnt the Palais des Tuileries, the Palais de Justice and the Hôtel de Ville with its treasures of art and irreplaceable archives. The Tuileries, destroyed in 1871, narrowly escaped destruction in 1848. The Palace was sacked and looted, but as Jules Bertaut drily remarks, "Heureusement les Français, toujours économies, se réservent quelque chose à détruire pour les révolutions futures ; les pillards ont raison des incendiaires et tout le monde ne se préoccupe plus que de remplir ses poches." (7) In October 1934 the "First Soviet Republic in Spain" was set up in the Asturias as the result of an armed

rebellion against the legal Government of Spain. During the course of the rebellion acts characteristic of mob vandalism resulted in the destruction of the world-famous Camera Santo and the 40,000 volumes of the Oviedo University Library. In the Spanish Civil War the Reds did not confine themselves to the destruction of churches or of the works of art which were the glory of those churches. The superstition that the Catholic Church is the enemy of science forms part of the stock-in-trade of revolutionary propaganda. In the Spanish War the friends of science broke into the famous astronomical observatory at Tortosa, built and maintained by the Jesuits, and destroyed the observatory and its instruments. In a letter to *The Times* on 24 April, 1933, Sir Bernard Pares, Professor of Russian at the University of London, wrote as follows :

There is no doubt whatever as to the accuracy of Professor Tchernavin's account of his treatment in Russian prisons. He is a distinguished ichthyologist, and has been able to supply us with details as to the fate of numerous scholars ; some of them are known to me, and some with European reputations, of whom we had lost track. Of the fifty-one in his own branch of science known to himself, twenty-five have been shot and twenty-six deported in three years (1930-1932). Among those whom he knew personally or met in prison his list includes six academicians and thirty-six other professors in various fields or custodians of museums.

Nowhere, indeed, has the persecution of scientists and intellectuals been more thorough and more bitter than in Soviet Russia.

I have seen educated men coming out of Russia (said Leo Pasvolsky) ; their general appearance, and particularly the crushed hopelessness of their mental processes, is a nightmare that haunts me every once in a while. They are a living testimonial to the processes that are taking place in Russia. . . . Such an exodus of the educated and intelligent as there has been out of Russia no country has ever seen, and certainly no country can ever afford. The Intelligentsia has lost everything it had. It has lived to see every ideal it revered shattered, every aim it sought pushed away almost out of sight. Embittered and hardened in exile, or crushed spiritually and physically under the present government, the tragedy of the Russian Intelligentsia is the most pathetic and poignant in human history. (8)

Every culture is the product of a philosophy. The culture of Christian Europe is derived from the belief in the infinite value of every individual human soul. "Proletculture" is the flower of the Marxian faith that the individual is no more than an unimportant cog in the machinery of an omnipotent State, and that the object of life is to increase the efficiency of mass production. With this end in view "the reading-books for the children are mechanized, and are designed to fix the child's attention on representations of technical objects; there are no pictures of flowers, animals, or such 'bourgeoise idyllic' things. The mind of the child is to be directed to machinery. 'Processions of children', wrote a visitor to Russia in October 1931, 'are seen marching with banners bearing inscriptions such as "Give us technical power!"'" (9) Mr. W. H. Chamberlin in *Russia's Iron Age* cites a journal entitled *For Marxist-Leninist Natural Science* which campaigned enthusiastically "for party spirit in mathematics", and "for purity of Marxist-Leninist theory in surgery". (10) A leading champion of Proletculture in Russia was Lounacharsky, who held the post of Commissar of Education. In his official organ, *Proletarskaia Kultura*, he writes:

Our enemies, during the whole course of the revolutionary period, have not ceased crying about the ruin of culture. As if they did not know that in Russia, as well as everywhere, there is no united common human culture, but that there is only a *bourgeois* culture, an individual culture, debasing itself into a culture of Imperialism—covetous, blood-thirsty, ferocious. The revolutionary proletariat aspires to free itself from the path of a dying culture. It is working out its own class, proletarian culture. . . . During its dictatorship, the proletariat has realized that the strength of its revolution consists not alone in a political and military dictatorship, but also in a cultural dictatorship.

A contributor to Lounacharsky's journal gives poetic form to the new cultural creed :

In the name of our To-morrow we will burn Rafael,
Destroy museums, crush the flowers of art.
Maidens in the radiant kingdom of the Future
Will be more beautiful than Venus de Milo,

Astronomy is to be transformed, according to the same journal, into a "teaching of the orientation in space and time of the efforts of labour". (11)

André Gide, perhaps the most distinguished literary convert to Communism in France, lost all his illusions after his first visit to Russia. He resented the iron conformity imposed upon all aspects of Russian cultural life.

Chaque matin, la *Pravda* leur enseigne ce qu'il sied de savoir, de penser, de croire (he wrote in *Retour de l'U.R.S.S.*). Et il ne fait pas bon sortir de là ! De sorte que, chaque fois que l'on converse avec un Russe, c'est comme si l'on conversait avec tous. (12) Ce que l'on demande à l'artiste, à l'écrivain, c'est d'être conforme ; et tout le reste lui sera donné par-dessus. (13) Si tous les citoyens d'un Etat pensaient de même, ce serait sans aucun doute plus commode pour les gouvernants. Mais, devant cet appauvrissement, qui donc oserait encore parler de "culture" ? (14) Et je doute qu'en aucun pays aujourd'hui, fût-ce dans l'Allemagne de Hitler, l'esprit soit moins libre, plus courbé, plus craintif (terrorisé), plus vassalisé. (15)

Gide's verdict on the cultural life of Russia is reinforced by another converted Communist, Victor Serge. Victor Serge served a sentence of five years in Belgium as a revolutionary, and took part in the revolutionary attempt by the Catalonians in 1917. He went to Russia in 1919, and was elected a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Unlike so many Left Wing intellectuals, he did not content himself with organizing terrorism from the rear, but faced death in the front-line trenches during the attack on Petrograd. His book *Russia Twenty Years After*, a terrible indictment of the system, is nowhere more outspoken than in its attack on "Managed Science and Literature" :

Geologists have been imprisoned (he writes) for having interpreted subsoil qualities differently from what was wanted in high places : ignorance of the natural wealth of the country, hence sabotage, hence treason. . . . Others have been shot. Bacteriologists have been thrown into prison for obscure reasons. The most celebrated one died in a Leningrad prison hospital. But the further removed laboratory research is from social life and technique the more chances it has of being pursued without impedi-

ment and even with encouragement (grants, honours). All this still does not prevent the activity of the Secret Service. The subsidies generously allotted to the physiologist Pavlov for researches into conditional reflexes did not prevent the arrest of his collaborators and friends. The encouragement given to the academician Yoffe for his researches into the structure of the atom did not prevent the deportation of his collaborators. The physicist Lazarev, after having been put in the very front rank of Soviet science, was imprisoned, deported, and then amnestied. (16)

Mr. Kurt London in his book *The Seven Soviet Arts*, which was published by Faber and Faber in 1937, gives us the first comprehensive survey of artistic production in Soviet Russia. The author is not a Communist, but he is as complimentary as his artistic conscience permits. He is uninterested in politics and economics, and these subjects provide the raw material for a few listless compliments; but he is so indifferent to these conventional tributes that he cannot even be bothered to relate them to each other. Thus on page seventy-one he describes the Soviet Constitution as "one of the most imposing documents in the history of nations", and on page seventy-nine he remarks that to differ from the views of the Politbureau is high treason, and naively adds, "Freedom of speech, which was guaranteed in the new Constitution, is a relative term, namely, a guarantee only within the framework of Socialist society." His anxiety to be pleasant makes his criticism of Soviet culture all the more damaging. Mr. Kurt London assures us that the more extreme forms of Proletculture are no longer modish, and, to be just, the Russian Communists proved less destructive than the "frenzied primitives" of Spain. True, in 1926 the authorities instructed a hundred and twenty libraries in Leningrad to destroy all volumes of *belles-lettres* dating from before 1917, but the treasures of art have been far more mercifully handled in Russia than in Red Spain. Moreover, the attitude to intellectuals is changing. In the earlier phases of the revolution intellectuals could choose between starvation, imprisonment, or a firing-squad. Today things have so far improved that intellectuals are offered the attractive alternatives of liquidation or prostitution. The writer,

artist or musician is offered every inducement to become a courtesan of culture. He can live in comfort provided that he writes, paints or composes what the Government desire to be written, painted or composed. No country does more to ensure a pleasant life to the artist provided that the artist is prepared to conform, though solicitude for the artist's welfare is perhaps sincere rather than subtle. "By a Government decree", writes Mr. London, "a 'House of Composers' is being built in Moscow in which 145 composers are to be housed." (17)

Mr. Kurt London, who explicitly declares that he is a friend of Soviet Russia, and who says all that can be said in favour of the system, sums up his verdict on this cultural prostitution in a passage all the more damning for its obvious restraint :

It must indeed be a terrible position (he writes) for artists who have to wrestle with their artistic conscience because they do not share the Government's views on art policy. On the one hand, a carefree, pleasant and full life beckons them, if they are willing to sing to the tune called by Stalin. On the other hand, they would be outlawed, and become not only artistic but also social outcasts, if they follow the bent of their personality. What is more, they would lose the economic basis of their existence. The only course left to them is either to give up their profession or their conscience. (18)

Mr. Maurice Hindus, who was born in Russia, who has revisited Russia many times since the Revolution, and who writes as a sympathetic critic of Communism, paints a tragic picture of the intelligentsia in his book *Humanity Uprooted*. The Revolution, he reminds us, was largely the creation of the Russian intellectuals. "Where would this much-vaunted proletarian, this roistering self-appointed master of Russia's destiny be if the intellectual had not lavished on him his sympathies, his talents, his very soul ?" Yet now that the revolution has triumphed the intellectual is not only "discarded, but disowned". If he wishes to join the Communist Party he must serve a period of probation for two years, whereas the proletarian is only on probation for six months. School-teachers in democratic countries who are naive enough to

hope that Communism would improve both their status and their income will learn from Mr. Hindus that "no intellectuals in Russia complain so vociferously of being under-paid as do teachers and physicians". The Russian intellectual of today lacks the social background of the old intelligentsia. "He has no soulfulness, no delicacy, no artistry. He has not even the competence of his predecessors. He is unkempt, uncouth, unshaven." (19)

Communists when confronted by the inescapable evidence for intellectual oppression in Soviet Russia evade the issue by stressing the achievement of the Soviet in its campaign against illiteracy.* The proportion of Russians who can read and write is probably higher than in Czarist Russia, but I am unpersuaded that culture gains by increasing the number of those who can read while simultaneously depreciating both the quantity and quality of the available literature. André Gide subjects to a searching examination the Soviet claim to have reduced illiteracy and improved education. He cites Lounacharsky to prove that whereas there were 62,000 primary schools under the old régime there were only 50,000 in 1924. He quotes Lounacharsky's statement that the salaries of rural teachers were often six months in arrears. He quotes from *Izvestia*, 16 November, 1936, an attack on the "surprising analphabetism among the pupils". From the same journal he quotes the statement that 80,000 scholars had run away from school during the preceding three years. *Pravda*, 11 January, 1937, inveighed against the wretched quality of the textbooks supplied to the schools. A geography text-book was enriched by a map in which Ireland was placed in the Sea of Aral and "les Iles d'Ecose" in the Caspian. A multiplication table contained the surprising statement that $8 \times 3 = 18$; $7 \times 6 = 72$; $5 \times 9 = 43$, etc. It would seem that the benefits of "*alphabétisme*" are of dubious value in Soviet Russia, excepting perhaps to officials anxious to show a profit on the Five Year Plan. Gide concludes in words addressed to the melancholy dupes of Communist propaganda, words which apply not only to

* "Illiteracy" is an ambiguous word which need not necessarily imply, as "*analphabetisme*" implies, the inability to read and write.

education but to all aspects of Soviet life. "Je proteste lorsque votre aveuglement, ou votre mauvaise foi, cherche à nous présenter comme admirables des résultats nettement piteux." (20)

Eugene Lyons, whose faith in Communism was shaken by his experiences in Russia, describes the "revolt against intelligence" in his striking book *Assignment in Utopia*. "The roster of scientists, historians, academicians, famous engineers, technical administrators, statisticians arrested at this time reads like an encyclopaedia of contemporary Russian culture." (21) Lyons supports by documentary evidence the charge that history, anthropology, seismology, philosophy and science are forced to "goose-step on the policy line". (22) "Even in the natural sciences there was plenty of grotesquery about 'Leninist surgery' and 'Stalinist mathematics' and ideological deviations in biology. Intellectual life was depressed to a dead level of conformist mediocrity. Charlatanism and mental prostitution were the easiest paths to artistic success." (23) Mr. Lyons contrasts the liberty enjoyed by Voltaire and Diderot under the monarchy and Tolstoy and Turgenieff under the Czars with the oppression of the intellectuals in Soviet Russia. (24) To modern progressives the Inquisition still symbolizes the ultimate horror of human intolerance, but compared with the OGPU the Inquisition was both tolerant and humane. It is, as Mr. Lyons insists, "more dangerous to question dialectical materialism according to Stalin in present-day Moscow than it had been to question the flatness of the earth in Rome of the Dark Ages". (25) Mr. Lyons forgets that the Copernican theory was first given to the world in a book written by a canon of the Church, financed by two cardinals, and dedicated to the Pope. The ecclesiastics blundered badly over Galileo, but his case is unique, for this was the only occasion on which a scientist was forced to retract a purely scientific proposition under compulsion from the Church. But there have been many Galileos condemned in Russia for "ideological deviations" in science.

Mr. Lyons points out that the Czars did not interfere in every sphere of intellectual and aesthetic expression

"like their successors in the Kremlin, so that there were a few sanctuaries for man as a thinker and an artist". (26) Authoritative régimes are not necessarily fatal to art and literature. Cervantes wrote his masterpiece in the Spain of the Inquisition, but the Spanish Inquisition, unlike the Russian Ogpu, did not concern itself with all aspects of life. Montaigne, the agnostic, wrote his *Essays* in a France in which heretics were intermittently burned. Catholic priests were tortured and racked under Elizabeth, but her authoritarian régime coincided with the most glorious epoch in English literature. Catholics, Protestants and agnostics have cited passages from Shakespeare to prove that Shakespeare was a Catholic, a Protestant or an agnostic, and there is perhaps a measure of truth in all three hypotheses. The statement that Shakespeare "died a papist" is disputed, but it may be true. It is undeniable that he conformed to the State religion during his life, and it is more than probable that his faith was disturbed by doubts. Be that as it may, he enjoyed a freedom of self-expression unknown in modern Russia, for Shakespearian detachment is impossible under the régime of Stalin. "To the Soviet censor," writes Mr. Lyons, "neutrality is one of the deadliest sins—every artist and scientist must show proof of active support of the official dogmas." (27) Had Queen Elizabeth been as ruthless as Stalin, Shakespeare would either have ceased to write or been liquidated.

All branches of Russian art have to submit to the dictatorship of mediocrity. Shostakovich's popular opera "And Quiet Flows the Don" was widely praised by music critics in Soviet Russia until *Pravda* sniffed out ideological heresy in operatic formalism, whereupon the critics came to heel. Yuri Olehsa, who had been an ardent admirer of Shostakovich's opera, promptly recanted. "If I do not agree with the articles in *Pravda* about art, I have no right to experience patriotic pleasure in apprehending these marvellous things, in apprehending the aroma of novelty, triumph, success which means so much to me and which shows that the Soviet Union has its own distinctive life, that of a great power. If I do not agree with the party in a single point, the whole

picture of life must be dimmed for me, because all parts, all details of this picture are bound together and arise one out of the other." (28) On 10 April 1935, the artist Nikritin was summoned before the art commission, which had taken exception to his painting "Old and New", a symbolic picture of no great merit in which he represents a Venus of Milo, a young man and a young girl, workers in the Metro building, and an old man. "What we see here is a calumny," exclaimed one member of the commission, "It is a class-attack inimical to the Soviet power. The picture must be removed and the appropriate organizational measures be taken." (29) The picture was removed, and no doubt appropriate organizational measures were taken.

It is instructive to compare the treatment of the artist Nikritin in Soviet Russia with the urbane attitude of the Venetian Inquisition to Veronese, whose irreverent painting of the Last Supper had caused considerable scandal. Here follows an extract from his examination.

Q. In this Supper of Our Lord have you painted any attendants?
A. Yes, my lord.

Q. What is the meaning of those men dressed in the German fashion, each with a halberd in his hand ?

A. We painters take the same licence that is permitted to poets and jesters. I have placed these two halberdiers—the one eating and the other drinking—by the staircase, to be supposed ready to perform any duty that may be required of them : it appeared to me quite fitting that the master of such a house, who was rich and great (as I have been told), should have such attendants.

Q. That person dressed like a buffoon, with a parrot on his wrist—for what purpose is he introduced into the canvas ?

A. For ornament, as is usually done.

Q. Does it appear to you fitting that at Our Lord's Last Supper you should paint drunkards, buffoons, Germans, dwarfs, and similar indecencies ?

A. No, my lord.

Q. Why, then, have you painted them ?

A. I have done it because I supposed that these were not in the place where the supper was served from.

As a handsome concession to the Holy Office, Veronese appears to have removed a man bleeding from the nose,

and a pair of soldiers in German costume "half drunk and in most questionable attitudes". But the painting was not destroyed, and may still be seen in the Accademia in Venice. Had the Venetian Inquisition been as intolerant as the Communists who condemned Nikritin, the painting would have been destroyed and Veronese would perhaps have been liquidated for a gross deviation of Christian ideology.

ARNOLD LUNN.

REFERENCES

1. Dauban, *La Démagogie à Paris en 1793*, p. 37, quoted by Nesta H. Webster: *The French Revolution*, Constable, p. 437.
2. *Petit Parisien*, 21 February, 1937.
3. *Papiers trouvés chez Robespierre*, II, 15, quoted by Nesta H. Webster: *The French Revolution*, Constable, p. 410.
4. *Moniteur* for the Fourteenth Fructidor, An II., quoted by Nesta H. Webster: *The French Revolution*, Constable, p. 412.
5. Taine, vii, 180, quoted by Nesta H. Webster: *The French Revolution*, Constable, p. 413.
6. *Pièces saisies chez Babeuf*, ii, 163, quoted by Nesta H. Webster: *World Revolution*, Constable, p. 56.
7. Jules Bertaut: *1848 et la Seconde République*, Arthème Fayard, p. 70.
8. Leo Pasvolsky: "The Intelligentsia under the Soviets", *Atlantic Monthly*, November 1920.
9. G. M. Godden: *The Communist Attack on Great Britain*; Burns Oates, p. 62.
10. William Henry Chamberlin: *Russia's Iron Age*, Duckworth, p. 296.
11. Quoted by Lothrop Stoddard: *The Revolt Against Civilization*, Chapman & Hall, p. 187.
- 12-15. André Gide: *Retour de l'U.R.S.S.*, Gallimard, pp. 49, 84, 77, 67.
16. Victor Serge: *Russia Twenty Years After*, translated by Max Shachtman, Hillman-Curl, p. 53.
- 17 and 18. Kurt London: *The Seven Soviet Arts*, Faber and Faber, pp. 37, 361.
19. Maurice Hindus: *Humanity Uprooted*, Jonathan Cape, chapter XIV, pp. 214-226.
20. André Gide: *Retouches à mon Retour de l'U.R.S.S.*, Gallimard, pp. 24-28.
- 21-27. Eugene Lyons: *Assignment in Utopia*, Harcourt, Brace, pp. 348, 468, 468, 469, 469.
- 28 and 29. Kurt London: *The Seven Soviet Arts*: Faber and Faber, pp. 81, 228.

THE SURVIVAL OF CHRISTENDOM

Christentum und Abendland. By Johannes Hollnsteiner.

Wiedergeburt der Menschlichkeit. By Hans von Hammerstein.

Die politischen Religionen. By Erich Voegelin. (Bermann-Fischer Verlag, Vienna.—Schriftenreihe "Ausblicke".*)

BECAUSE he believes at once in human free-will and in the power of the spirit to renew the face of the earth, the Christian thinker cannot accept without reserve the prophecies of Spengler or of others who regard the decline of Western civilization as the inevitable result of a pre-determined historical process. He knows that while man again and again acts like his fellows in the same circumstances he may at any time defy expectations and do something contrary to the experience of centuries. Or, since God did at one time intervene in the historical sequence and through the Incarnation started the greatest revolution of all time, He may again intervene and by a lesser miracle save Western man from his own folly and re-establish Christendom. On the other hand God is not bound to intervene; He guarantees the lasting security of His Church but not the maintenance of any particular civilization, however grand it may have been. And it is no argument against human freedom that man in the mass acts constantly in the way that is expected of him; even Christian man may suffer a decline and the civilization he has laboriously built up may, through his own neglect, go the way of others.

The three books above-named may be best described as variations on this theme of the survival of Christendom. They are all by Christians refusing to give up their belief in the permanence of our civilization and yet admitting that their optimism may be all-too-little justified. Hans von Hammerstein gives the most charming expression to this thought :

And one day, when everything is forgotten and no one knows any more whether Technics is properly an Italian or a Spanish

* Yet another enterprise whose promise was cut short by the destruction of the old Austria. Happily, the publishing house has been transferred to Stockholm, where, we hope, it may flourish for many years to come.

word or whether Aeroplane is derived partly from the French and must be pronounced accordingly, perhaps strange conquerors will come again and excavate our buried culture, with surprise and joy discovering that it embraces also the Greek and Roman of which they had never heard. And the serene gods of Olympus will once more celebrate with those of cloudy Asgard their early blessedness. There will be those too who will bring to light from half-mouldered books and tattered music scores Homer and Goethe, Gluck and Richard Wagner. They will also learn from a variety of documents that in 1940, before we finally abandoned the study of the humanities, we still had really educated men in every calling but that our culture rapidly declined in the centuries which followed and that there is in fact as little to recover from our remains as we were able to recover from the time of the wandering of the peoples.

Then they will excavate also Oswald Spengler and they will marvel that we who were able to find this seer justified at every step in the course of history still would not believe in the decline of the West (pp. 55-56).

If we are to talk about the survival of Christendom it is obviously of primary importance to ask what Christendom means, how it was formed and whether it exists at all today in order to survive. For this question of origins and historical development Hollnsteiner's book is perhaps the most valuable. Hammerstein also looks into the past but is most concerned to explain the present, and Voegelein writes about a particular and very important aspect of the problem of our age.

Whether we call it simply "The West", "Europe", or use the more felicitous German name of "Evening-land—*Abendland*", we are thinking of something that is more than a geographical area. Even if we do not call it "Christendom" we see it as an order of things which has been formed and is still to a large extent penetrated by Christianity. And since order is an organic reality, derived from the vital contact of a variety of objects each of which makes a specific contribution to the resultant unity, Christendom is an organism, a living thing. Originating in the East, Christianity spread itself in all directions but found its centre providentially in the capital of the ancient world ; it was strongest within the borders of the Roman Empire and after centuries of persecution succeeded in becoming the dominant formative power

within that area. Hollnsteiner shows how different was the development in the East and why the Church there became a *Staatskirche* while the Western polity rather took on the aspect of a *Kirchenstaat*. It would be an over-simplification to say that the Pope took the place of the Emperor in the West and the Emperor the place of the Pope in the East, but something very much like that happened through the transference of the imperial capital. In the absence of the Emperor, the people looked to the one power now ruling in Rome to defend them and prevent the collapse of the Empire. In Byzantium, however, the priests could not forget the sacred character which had always been associated with the person of the Emperor, "In the Byzantine Emperors there dwelt always something of the *Summus Pontifex*",* and it was not difficult for him to render the Church subservient to his wishes. The result was the Eastern schism. Church and Empire became degenerate, and while the Pope, appreciating the material danger to Christendom, was calling the peoples of Europe to arms against the Turk the Easterns were flocking into the Cathedral of Sancta Sophia "hoping there to obtain help from the angels, in reality however only to be murdered or sold as slaves in their thousands".† The tradition of Caesaro-Papism lived on in the now separated national Churches of the East and ruined what influence they might have had on culture and civilization.

The Western Church, raised to a dominant position, realized and fulfilled a political and cultural mission. The freedom which it gained from Constantine made this possible but the mission arose from its very nature. Only a superficial mind can make an absolute distinction between religion and politics; both belong in the last resort to the intellectual sphere; politics uninfluenced by religious motives are mere power politics and a religion which has no effect on the actions of politicians is rapidly reduced to sentiment. Actually politicians who claim to separate the two spheres always end by subordinating religion to the State or even giving to politics a religious character. The latter is manifest in National-Socialism,

* Hollnsteiner, p. 15.

† P. 18.

the former in Liberalism. At the outset of Christendom's history however the Church was able to insist on taking her proper position and to exercise her benign influence on politics. Having no material force at her disposal, the Church had to work in a spiritual fashion, influencing men's minds, not abolishing but reforming existing institutions. Roman law thus became penetrated with the Christian idea of the community, the members of which are bound by love to one another and to God, obliged not only by the written law but by the law which is known by reason alone. This Natural Law was given a clearer meaning through Revelation and a greater force through the newly appointed sanctions. The decline of slavery, the insistence on the right of private property and the Guild social order are some of the better-known results of this formative power of the Church. In all this gigantic activity the diversities of the European nations were respected and it was due to the Church that they maintained themselves at all.

The Germans especially owe their unity to the Church. Apart from Christianity the tribes had little in common and Charlemagne in conquering the Saxons was wiser in his day than Hitler marching into Austria, for he saw that unless he bound them to the other Germans by a spiritual bond of Christianity he would only establish "a passing compulsory connection of victor and vanquished".* Not only that but "the Germans have to thank the Papacy that they came to take up for centuries not a role of any kind but the role of leadership in the West".†

In cultural matters, however, they were more difficult to convert, though even here the influence of the Church finally prevailed. Her monasteries were the outposts of culture in a barbarian world. The monks taught the new converts the dignity of human labour, educated their children and even improved their methods of agriculture. The Christian teaching on marriage restored the family to its proper dignity and the convents at once educated women and restored them to their original status. Appreciation of the meaning of the

* Hollnsteiner, p. 36.

† P. 34.

Christian community led to active co-operation and brotherly love amongst individuals and peoples. Finally, this unobserved but none the less genuine revolution brought about a respect for human personality which is one of the most marked characteristics of the Western world.

These values and above all the Christian conception of personality were not first attacked when Liberalism had to give way in the post-War years to the advance of the dictatorships. It was Liberalism, itself the result of the break-up of the Christian community in the Reformation, which by asserting man's unrestricted freedom justified the rule of might and logically led both to Communism and the dictatorships.* Not only are Christian influences now rejected but even the nature of man is attacked. A Christian renovation of society and a rebirth of humanity are alike necessary. With the last problem Hans von Hammerstein is mainly concerned and he paints a vivid picture of the rottenness of the contemporary European society, beginning with a sentence delightful in its clever sarcasm :

"Not as if it were dead and buried, humanity. Who would dare to assert that in view of the wide variety of the accomplishments of Hygiene, of Social Welfare and of the zealous activity of associations for animal protection?"

Then he begins his attack on the inhumanity of our times.

War, especially in the most modern forms, is inhuman. So also is big industry, the great city which it has created and the mass—the proletariat—which is the result of both. "*Edel sei der Mensch*", wrote Goethe, and Hammerstein, commenting on this, claims that man can be noble—even in the midst of battle. But he must feel himself to be one with his fellow men, must respect the common rights of men and realize that the neighbour whom he must love is man pure and simple, "not the member of his class, race or nation".† He has forgotten this, nation is set against nation and war is in the air ; even within

* "Der Liberalismus wurde der Bahnbrecher für den Marxismus und in letzter Folge für jede Diktatur." (Hollnsteiner, p. 52.)

† Hammerstein, p. 14.

the State order is only maintained through an effective police force. We are in a state of "civilized barbarity", and if we would try to excuse ourselves by pleading ignorance or a certain natural human stupidity this author has the stinging retort at hand : "Stupidity can no longer be excused after a thousand years of culture, civilization and education."*

The growth of industry led to the severance of personal relations between employer and employed, the latter being counted as mere "hands" and, even in their resistance to injustice, being content to accept the same material outlook. The great city has dehumanized man, filled up his day with work and yet left him at a loss to know what to do with the time that remains over. He cannot be happy alone, he must hasten feverishly from place to place, at once escaping from the city and yet taking its spirit with him. "For a long time now the city has had no Sunday, no day of peace, of sanctification, on which man could listen to himself and the God who dwells within him. . . . The city also accompanies him wherever he goes, it rushes out to the country and, what is worse, drags the country itself into its own fierce haste."† "Industry and the great city have given birth to the masses and that is the great problem of our time."‡ The growth of industry brought man to the great centres, away from the country, herded him with his kind in restricted quarters and left him little or no time for leisure and attendance to the needs of his soul. Away from the village church, he became de-christianized ; uprooted from the countryside, he rapidly lost his cultural background, and the advance of popular education did nothing to make up for this ; since both culture and Christianity belong to the intellectual sphere, the loss of these meant the degrading of human nature in its nobler aspect and in effect the dehumanization of the masses. Hammerstein admits that something is being done to solve the problem but questions the efficacy of the methods employed. The masses are mastered, disciplined, militarized. But "whither will the militarized mass march ? If not round in a circle, it will soon come up against

* P. 15.

† P. 21.

‡ P. 22.

another mass", with the resultant danger of war.* The attempts too to make a nation out of the mass must fail so long as it is forgotten that the nation consists of individuals and is not a dull uniformity. In fact man is not satisfied, he yearns for the full realization of his human nature even though he does not know how this is to be attained; "the loveliest barracks do not make him happy".†

One thing is certain: if the problem is solved at all it will be *through* the masses and not through the comparatively small number of wealthy and powerful individuals who obtained their position as a result of economic and political conditions that are rapidly disappearing. After the first rush of the masses to the city industries culture was maintained by the privileged few who had the wealth and leisure to enjoy it, but the modern millionaire, rejoicing in all the products of an advanced technical civilization, knows as little about culture as his meanest employee and is even more of a pagan. For him the material value of a thing is the sole value; "Time is money" is his favourite slogan and "according to the number of visitors is the value of a library, a school or a lecture estimated".‡ The day of the wealthy appreciative patron of the arts is at an end as is also that of the Christian monarch or feudal lord. The revolutionaries of 1789 did not wholly succeed in destroying the tradition of the Christian Emperor but ultimately their efforts brought about the existence of the nineteenth-century wealthy bourgeois type, generally a freemason, who is being finally destroyed in the modern revolution. Hitler, a man out of the masses, came to conquer the last stronghold of the Christian monarchical principle in Austria even as he crushed that freemasonry which was its most inveterate enemy.

The old order is already passed, the temporary bourgeois nineteenth-century order has gone the way of the absolutist State which preceded it and of the grand Christian civilization of late mediaeval Europe. What is most obvious in present-day Europe is a violent secular

* P. 24.

† Vierkandt, quoted by Messner, *Die Soziale Frage*, p. 212. Tyrolia-Verlag, Vienna, 1938.

‡ P. 24.

movement of the masses, ignorant of spiritual values, seeking to satisfy the needs of their human nature in the benefits of a material civilization, submitting to discipline, militarization and uniformity and vaguely seeing in the idea of the nation or class some substitute for the religion they have lost. These who should be their leaders are either being overcome by the vehemence of this new movement or are themselves unable to see beyond its false principles. If this be the real state of that Europe which has been called Christendom then survival becomes highly questionable if not impossible. For outside the traditional frontiers of Europe the same forces are at work, the same materialist movements, with even more likelihood of success. Amongst those external hostile powers must be reckoned not only the yellow races but also Russia—in spite of the war between Japan and China, the hostility between Russia and Japan and the apparent friendship of European powers for one of the contending parties in the Far East. Their material strength might easily outweigh that of a united Europe . . . and Europe is not united.

The struggle of ideologies, all of them materialist, is now an accepted factor in European political life. Fascism seemed at one time as if it might be a very different thing from National Socialism, but now the two movements are boasting not only of their unity of interests but also of outlook, even in the racialist myth. It is true that they claim to be the saviours of Europe and they would be happy to defend a Europe united under their hegemony and accepting their spirit. Unfortunately that spirit is at worst anti-Christian and at best ignores the influence of that which was the formative power in Western civilization. It would be absurd to fight for Europe under such leadership, for the cause would have been lost even before the struggle began. Against them and weaker than they are the philosophies of Liberal Democracy and Communism, both of which have already done so much to destroy the spirit of Christianity in Europe and cannot in any case long prevail against the vigorous nationalism of the opposing powers.

It is these ideologies with which, under the title of

"The political religions", the last author is mainly concerned. To explain how politics and religion can be so identified he has to go back to ancient Egypt, to a time when the king was recognized as God appearing for a period on this earth and receiving at once religious worship and temporal obedience. Through the establishment of the Church, the traditional distinctions between God and Caesar and the constant assertion of the perfection of the two societies, we have become accustomed to the strict delimitation of the political from the religious sphere. Now, however, the delimitation is again being obscured.

Voegelin quotes Ernst Jünger as finding the terrible destruction of life in the Great War to be legitimized by Faith, "they fell. . . out of the Germany of temporal appearance into the eternal Germany".* It is of course in National-Socialist Germany where the most perfect form of political religion is manifested today and Voegelin gives an excellent analysis of it: "The Führer is the place at which the national spirit breaks into history; the immanent God speaks to the Führer as the transcendent God spoke to Abraham, and the Führer forms the words of God in issuing orders to the people. . . . Führer and people are bound together in the sacramental substance, which lives in the one as in the other; God does not stand outside, but lives in man himself; and it is thence possible for the national spirit to express itself in the will of the people and the voice of the people to become God's voice."† There are innumerable examples of Nazi leaders using almost the same language, one of the most notorious being a litany intoned by Hitler's deputy swearing in party-officers at Munich, and one of the strongest points of the Pope's encyclical was that directed against the abominable misuse of holy words by the National-Socialists.

The reason for these political religions is not to be found merely in post-war conditions or the Versailles Treaty. They have their counterparts in movements which appeared even at the time of the Church's greatest power, but they are more intense than the earlier ones

* P. 35.

† Pp. 55-56.

because they correspond to the needs of the largely secularized masses. Man cannot live without some religion and, having been to a great extent withdrawn from the influence of Christianity, he has been compelled to satisfy his religious needs in one or other of these *Ersatz* religions and to worship God in the form of the class, the nation or race.

Only the dynamic, especially of the nationalist ideologies, is such that war within the historic borders of Christendom is an ever-present danger. This, it seems to many, is the greatest of all evils and would inevitably mean the end of civilized Europe. Certainly it would be a tremendous disaster and its effect on Europe might be appalling, but the successful attainment of Nazi aims under peaceful conditions could not be much less disastrous. Continued success and increased power would only accelerate that destruction of Christianity which is now manifestly intended. It is however some comfort to know that even the Nazis have recognized that another war might mean the destruction of themselves and Europe because of its effect on the birth-rate. "Racial hygiene and war will always be irreconcilable enemies", says Dr. Arthur Gütt in the newest defence of German policy;* and he quotes statistics to show the disastrously rapid decrease in the birth-rate from 1915 to 1919. Another war therefore would not only weaken Europe through its mutual antagonisms but, if it lasted any length of time, would also mean the practical extinction of the white races. Materially at least they could not prevail against the vigorous and prolific Asiatics.

Even apart from war this problem of the birth-rate is one of the most serious of our times and most relevant to the survival of Christendom. In a recent series of articles in the *Tablet*† Mr. E. R. Roper Power has outlined the present trends in England, analysed the meaning of them and indicated some of the appalling consequences of declining fertility. It is better among Catholics than elsewhere, but the reality of the decline cannot be denied.

* *Germany Speaks*. (Thornton Butterworth, 1938, p. 65).

† Jan. 22, 29, Feb. 5, 12, 1938. Published later as a pamphlet by the Catholic Social Guild: "Population Prospects", 2d.

In less than a century we are faced with a prospect of a population which is one-tenth of its present level. Not only will it be more slender, it will also be older. "At the present time about one half of the population is over thirty; fifty years hence it is likely that more than half will be over forty." Similar statistics were given for Switzerland in an illuminating article in the July number of the *Schweizerische Rundschau* by Albert Studer. He mentions that in 1900 there was an average of 266 children to 1,000 women capable of child-bearing; in 1936, when the dangers of motherhood were so much reduced, the number sank to 131. "Those of our women therefore who could be mothers bring scarcely half the number of children into the world which our mothers brought." Again in 1901 there were 3.3 millions in Switzerland and 100,000 births; in 1935 only 65,000 births although the population had meanwhile increased to 4.1 millions. It cannot be claimed that this is balanced by the decrease in deaths, for he shows that the apparent gain of 25,000 souls in this respect is set off by the birth-decrease of 55,000 (allowing for the increased population). In other words in one year 30,000 children who should be born never appear, in twenty years 60,000 and in a generation 1,000,000. In 1950 the Swiss schools will be practically empty at this rate, and it will be impossible to assemble an army in twenty years; children are too dear indeed to be considered as cannon-fodder, but the need of adequate defence to maintain a nation's independence is obvious. Coming from Switzerland, a country which was neutral in the Great War, these figures are particularly valuable; though the author does speak of that period as a time of a "birth-strike".

Messner is even more concerned about the relevance of this problem to the future of Christendom. Quoting Wolf on the sexual problem of our times, he states that the Russian population increases by three million each year and that the time cannot be far distant when the Russians will outnumber the true Europeans and the yellow races the white. At the very end of his great work on the social problem stands the warning: "In truth: only the period of a single generation is given us to avoid the awful

destiny which is marked on the horizon."* With or without war, it seems that our material resources are thus likely to be seriously reduced as against those of the races outside of and hostile to Christendom. War would be disastrous mainly because it would hasten that reduction. It is true that the Nazis especially have realized this danger and that they and the Fascists also are making tremendous efforts to increase the birth-rate, but even the methods of totalitarianism cannot force women to bear children, and it is very questionable if the present increase in the birth-rate of Germany and Italy can be maintained. And in spite of professions of peace, the exaggerated nationalism of these powers cannot fail to rouse such opposition as must ultimately lead to war.

Only one thing can save Europe—a Christian renovation. For Christianity gives the highest motives to encourage child-bearing and the proper use of marriage. In the last resort only attention to these motives will bring about a genuine and permanent increase in the population of Christendom, and the spiritual renovation which comes from Christianity may be that imponderable element which will save the European peoples when they are threatened by vastly superior Asiatic forces. Moreover, the threatened war can only be averted by the peace-making power of the Church and the divisions of Europe only healed by its unitive force. Clearly Christendom means first of all an order of things inspired by Christianity, and if Christian influences are not allowed to restore order among the peoples, unity in society, to establish just industrial conditions and change the face of the great city—in a word, if Christianity does not re-humanize and win back for itself the masses, then Western Europe can no longer be called Christendom. Far from surviving, Christendom would be already at an end.

A superficial glance at recent events might suggest that this is indeed the case. Industrial conditions have improved since the time of Pope Leo XIII, but to a large extent under non-Catholic influences and the response of Catholics to the appeal of their leader was disappointingly small; moreover, injustice, greed and exploitation of the

* *Die Soziale Frage*, p. 694.

worker are still far too frequent in industry. The peace-making efforts of the popes neither prevented the War of 1914-18 nor secured a just settlement after it. In the post-War years Communism was more readily accepted by the masses than the Christian social revolution, and the authoritative movements which sought to destroy Communism also ruined precisely those Catholic social efforts which seemed to contain the greatest promise of success. Even though an age-old struggle between Church and State in Italy was happily settled in 1929, there are signs today of the outbreak of a still more serious dispute. The Pope's advocacy of a corporative system of society met with official approval in Dollfuss' Austria and the ideal of a Christian State was coming very close to realisation in that country, only to be brought to a sudden, brutal and apparently final end at the beginning of the present year. But it may reasonably be asked: In all these changes and chances of international, political and social life are there not manifest signs of the vitality of the Church? And is it not likely that the pontificate of Pius XI will go down in history as comparable to that of a Gregory the Great or a Hildebrand, even on account of its formative influence on Europe? Hildebrand died in exile, but he is remembered because he brought the Emperor to Canossa and symbolized thus for all time the superiority of the Church. Similarly the outspoken denunciations of exaggerated nationalism and the firm exposition of Christian social principles by Pope Pius XI will be remembered when the temporary successes of his opponents are long forgotten.

Certainly the head of the Church has not neglected his traditional task of educating Christendom. His attention to the foreign missions has reminded European Catholics of their obligation to spread the Faith beyond their own frontiers, and his interest in the Eastern separated Churches has made us see what is good in an alien culture and how the truly Catholic love unites both Europeans and their erstwhile opponents. He has condemned without fear or favour the pagan ideologies which threaten to destroy Europe, repeatedly calling attention to the

menace of Communism, but he has also penned one of his finest letters against the errors of National-Socialism.* Even in his condemnations he has also sought to build up ; he has devoted one encyclical precisely to the subject of social reconstruction and has endeavoured to remedy the ills of society by reasserting at once the obligations of the married state and of the priesthood. In all these things and in the organization of Catholic Action, which has been one of the more notable achievements of his pontificate, he has constantly had in mind the spiritualization of the estranged masses. This tremendous activity has not been without effect. German Catholic Action after its post-war successes might appear to have entirely succumbed to the onslaughts of totalitarianism. Yet in fact it persists, in a secret and more heroic fashion. The Church in Germany is showing its vitality by adapting its institutions to the needs of the times, and its very suffering is creating a bond with other suffering Christians which may be the basis of a firmer unity and a stronger Christendom when the persecutors are long forgotten. In France and Belgium Catholic Action is affecting the lives of all classes of society through its admirably specialized movements. But especially, through the J.O.C., is it directed to those working masses in whose hands lies the future of Christendom. Best of all, it succeeds, increases in membership and is quite plainly forming the young workers of Europe to submit their labour and their whole lives to the Christian spirit.

Good may come, too, out of the tragedy of Austria, where the Papal ideals seemed to be coming nearest to realization. Austria failed in the last resort because these ideals had never had the support of the masses. Apart from the Nazi invasion they might have been won over, but only after years of re-education and training under Christian influences. It is ardently to be desired that this will be kept in mind in the organization of the new Spain. It is not enough to draw up Labour Charters, however admirable these may be ; the people must also

* *Mit Brennender Sorge* should be read in the original to be appreciated at its full value or even to be properly understood at all. The English translation is notoriously weak, probably because there simply does not exist an English equivalent for many of the German words.

be won over to appreciate the ideals contained in them. Long after the victory is achieved and the guns are silent the people of Spain will be in need of sympathetic training in the principles of the Christian social order. Christianity must have first place in the rebuilding of Europe and the formation of the masses. Culture must be recreated under supernatural influences (which the Christian cannot ignore as a factor in world history), and thus, as Hammerstein demands, a soul be given to civilization. Even then Christendom may not survive, but at least a nucleus will be left to convert the invaders and form with them a new European order which can differ only in non-essentials from the old. "The world's great age begins anew."

EDWARD QUINN.

CHARLES WOGAN—SOLDIER AND DIPLOMATIST

THE first part of this article, together with the earlier papers entitled *The Marriage of James III.**, brings the story of Charles Wogan down to the date 2 September, 1719 of the King's wedding to Clementine Sobieska. Wogan had still many years to live; and though no adventure came his way comparable for romantic interest with the famous rescue or even with his own escape from Newgate, study of these years is not—or so I believe—without historical value. Soon after the wedding, he and Sir John Misset† decided to transfer themselves to the Spanish service, setting out for Madrid in November with letters of recommendation from James to Philip V. Their reasons are not hard to divine. While Orleans and Dubois held the reins there was little ambitious young Jacobites could hope to achieve in France; while James's own little court at Rome was overflowing with English, Scottish and Irish gentlemen, many of whom had lost everything they formerly possessed and were thus wholly dependent upon the King's bounty. In Spain, on the other hand—and Spain, be it remembered, was still counted a great Power—not only personal advancement but an opportunity to serve the cause seemed to offer itself. For, in spite of Alberoni's failure and subsequent disgrace, a further attempt to restore the Stuarts with the aid of Spanish arms seemed by no means unlikely. Both for political and religious reasons, Philip V was eager to see a Catholic king again reigning over Great Britain; while the Queen (Elizabeth Farnese) had in addition a lively personal affection for her cousin, James's consort.

In Madrid the two Irishmen were warmly welcomed, each being given the titular rank of Colonel in the Spanish Army, with promise of further speedy promotion.

* DUBLIN REVIEW, January and April, 1928.

† It will be remembered that in recognition of their services in the Innsbruck affair James had knighted all the adventurers, conferring upon Wogan also a Baronetcy of the kingdom of Ireland; while the Pope, grateful for what they had done for his god-daughter, advanced each of them to the rarer dignity of Roman Senator.

But though similar promises were often repeated, no military advancement ever came their way, even after they had both distinguished themselves in the Moorish War of 1732, during which Misset, by his friend's testimony, "saved Oran and the troops on that fatal day when General Marquis de Santa Cruz perished".

For the neglect they so unexpectedly suffered there were no doubt other reasons than the incurable procrastination and confusion of the Court. As the hopes of a Restoration steadily declined under Walpole's astute, if corrupt and cynical, administration of English foreign and domestic affairs, Spanish Ministers may well have shrunk from offending London, by favours bestowed upon two such notable Jacobites. Moreover, there was the unhappy estrangement between James and Clementine. Wogan and Misset were no doubt regarded as more especially James's protégés; and the Queen of Spain never seems to have forgiven James for having quarrelled, however justifiably, with her kinswoman. When, shortly after Clementine's retirement into a Convent, Misset presented himself before Patino, then Chief Minister, he was

received like a dog in a nine-pin alley, and ordered to return immediately to his regiment and think himself happy in keeping what he had; for neither he nor Wogan were ever to raise their heads higher in the service.*

Nevertheless, it is clear from what Wogan himself says elsewhere that he at least, for a time, enjoyed high favour at Court, favour which he was again to enjoy from 1744 onwards. I insist on this point because his intimacy with the Spanish Sovereigns and their successive Ministers adds considerably to the historical value of his letters and despatches. Between 1720 and 1726 he appears to have been almost continuously resident at Madrid, where, though without official status, he acted, sometimes under the Duke of Ormonde, sometimes independently, as a diplomatic agent for James III.

* Sir Charles Wogan to James III, 22 June, 1741. (*Stuart Papers*).

Enjoying easy access both to Philip and to his Ministers, he was able to keep Rome informed of the undercurrents in Spanish affairs, a matter at that time of great importance to the Jacobite cause. He could write with the greater freedom, because James Hay, afterwards Lord Inverness, who had succeeded Mar as Secretary of State, was one of his most intimate friends. The loyalty of these two men to one another is indeed a bright spot in the sorry story of jealousy and intrigue which caused James, throughout his long, unhappy life, so much trouble and sorrow. It is the more creditable because, divided as they were by religion, nationality, temperament and estranging seas, they might so easily have taken opposite sides in the continued quarrel at Rome. Apart from anything else, Wogan might well have resented his supersession at a certain stage in the negotiation of the Sobieska marriage by Hay's brother-in-law, Murray—a step described by Andrew Lang in his *Prince Charles Edward* as "the beginning of evils". Nor were there wanting mischief-makers like Lord Semphill, who, writing to condole with Hay on his "ill-treatment by the frivolous tongues of the druggs of Her Majesty's service", explained that by "the druggs" he meant "Sir John Misset, Oughan, that sett".

So much being said by way of preface, let us turn to an examination of correspondence itself as it appears in the *Stuart Papers* at Windsor. I take first, both as having reference to a notable event and as highly characteristic of Wogan's free and easy style, a letter addressed to the King himself on 20 February, 1721, immediately upon receipt of the news of the birth of the Prince of Wales.

Tho I am strangely tempted by my foreknowledge of these glad tidings, [he begins], to sett up for the Spirit of Prophecy, I beg leave in the name of the absent Senators to renew those compliments I did myself the honour to make to your Majesties some months before their time, thro' at least strong presumption of the happy event. . . . Heaven, that has been pleased to grant in his Royal Highness an earnest of succession to the most ancient Royal Line in the world, will not fail in its goodness and in its own time to secure and establish it by those blessings of health and prosperity

that your Majesties are entitled to by your submission to its Providence and by the justice of your cause. I need not mention to your Majesty the joy of your loyal subjects in this place, but must do justice to the honest Spaniards, who swear that neither they nor their forefathers have ever been so much putt out of their gravity by the birth of any Prince of their own. This old town has been all in a flame for three nights with fire-works, illuminations and artillery. The Dames have ventured abroad for the first time to Balls and Assemblies, and their husbands have for the first time got drunk. Sober Don Pedro de Montemayor hopes, he says, in a few days to come to his right senses ; and our Whiggish Consul here has been provoked by his spleen into a feaver. The like train of rejoicing has been at Murcia and all the towns about us.

A letter written three years later to the Secretary of State gives a singularly vivid account of the temporary abdication of Philip V.

You'll have known before this comes to your hands one of the most surprising events that have appeared on ye theater of this world, a King of 40 years and in good health abdicating freely his kingdoms to become a hermit in a wilderness ; with a wife of 31, reserving for his society the Marquesses of Grimaldo, Valouse and his Confessor, for the Queen's attendance the Princess of Robec and a Spanish lady, the family consisting of two Camerites, two valets-de-chambre and six footmen, for their guard only two halbadiers. . . . Last night the news came to Madrid and occasioned a general consternation—all the strangers, particularly the Italians, know not what ground they stand on. These last had a principal share in all employment civil and military, and therefore hated by the Spaniards who get by this change ye management of affairs. King Philip has named a Council for his son, all natives excepting ye Marquis de Leda . . . the Marquis d'Aytona who is President of the Council of War is no friend to any stranger. Orendain, formerly commis to Grimaldo, succeeds him, and has appeared always well inclined towards us, but Castellar is ye person we can most depend upon so far as his power will reach. K. Philip receives to himself a yearly pension of 100,000 Spanish pistolls, has settled 25,000 upon each of ye Infants and about 9,000 on the Infanta.

The new régime, however, was of short duration, for a few months later the young king died and his father resumed the throne.

Early in the New Year Wogan sent Hay an amusing account of the Spanish Court, of which he remarks :

delay is the original sin, and tho' one has promises and justice on one's side, the performance is yet in the Anabaptist way, and he must in ye ordinary course be some years demanding before ye efficacious grace is actually conferred upon him.

The truth of this observation was later to be proved only too conclusively in a weightier matter: the assistance promised to Charles Edward during the Forty Five. At the moment it was evoked by the delays imposed upon Wogan's projected marriage with one of the many Irish ladies then to be found at the Spanish Court. His fiancée was one Mrs. O'Driscoll, a widow "bred at St. Germains and finished at Madrid", where she held an appointment in the Queen's household. Mrs. O'Driscoll had prudently insisted upon "the decency of setting up house with something of a comfortable air", and was prosecuting a claim for "12,000 Roman crowns or an equivalent in confiscated lands"; while Wogan himself had been promised, a year before, "a pension of 200 pistolls a year, with the assurance of a Brigadier's rank at the next promotion". But both claims, though admitted, were continually deferred. Meanwhile, for reasons not stated, a dispensation was needed from Rome; and this Hay made haste to procure through the good offices of James's staunch friend in the Sacred College, Cardinal Gualterio. In the end all difficulties were removed, for the Queen, who evidently had a great liking for Wogan, whom she described as "a pretty fellow, bateing a whimsical turn he had about the nose" stood his good friend. But though, as he confesses, their Catholic Majesties both showed him great kindness—the King doubling his pay and that of Sir John Misset and decreeing a continuation of Mrs. O'Driscoll's pension in the Royal Family as if she still continued her service there, a sad disappointment was in store for them. It is clear that Wogan counted upon being allowed to remain at Court after the marriage, and thus being able to continue his diplomatic work as hitherto in close

touch with the Spanish Government. Instead, he found himself despatched to garrison duty in a wretched village in northern Spain.

Surrounded on all sides by bleak and desert hills, that has nothing of its own growth but eels and partridge : to render it more agreeable we live almost in constant shade by reason of ye continual fogs that hang over us.

The cause of this disagreeable interruption of a civilized life was no doubt the strained relations then existing between France and Spain, consequent upon the sudden rupture, at the instance of the Duc de Bourbon, of the marriage contract between the young Louis XV and a Spanish Infanta. But though Philip and his Queen were furiously angry, Wogan rightly believed that war would be averted.

We look bigg upon our frontier [he wrote to Hay (now Earl of Inverness) in December 1725], where we have almost all our troops a-marshalling, our fortifications a-repairing, and magazines a-filling, as if we had nothing in view but bloody warr. The French on their side are makeing just the necessary preventions : the Pyreneans cover'd with snow are between us and must hinder us for some months from comeing to any violence with each other. In ye spring we don't pretend to invade France, and France has no design to be at ye further expence of invading us. . . . Besides with all our grim looks, we are already ye civillest enemys in ye world, in giving back deserters on both sides and treating, where we must treat, with all ye politeness imaginable. . . . As our King here is the eldest, I verily believe him (wt ever folks may say) ye wisest Prince of ye house of Bourbon. He has had reason to be piqued very sensibly and must be satisfied some way, but not by any methods yet must make him forget ye necessity of a good understanding between ye two branches.

As for our affairs . . . I really believe from wt his Catholic Majesty has been graciously pleased to tell myself . . . that there is a real fund of religion and personal affection here, if times and opportunityes offer'd to exert it. Our good Cardinall is no longer abhorr'd . . . I wou'd to heaven he once [? more] had ye management of affairs, yet he might sett all right, since 'tis given to him alone to render Spain formidable. If ever kingdom wanted a prime and resolute minister, 'tis this.

The reference in the last sentence can only be, I imagine, to Cardinal Alberoni ; and, if it be so, shows that Wogan had somewhat lost touch with developments in Rome. For since his arrival there, Alberoni set upon recovering favour at Madrid, as at once the champion of the Church and of Elizabeth's kinswoman, had played a most mischievous role in sustaining Clementine in her refusal to return to her husband, and this in direct opposition to the frequently expressed advice both of her own spiritual director and of the Pope himself. Quite possibly a misplaced delicacy had prevented Inverness from apprising his correspondent of the true state of things, since one of the chief causes of the quarrel was the Queen's inveterate dislike of Inverness himself, of his wife and of his brother-in-law, William Murray (Lord Dunbar), principal tutor to the two boys, Charles Edward and Henry, later the Cardinal Duke of York.

A letter despatched to Inverness three months later is devoted wholly to the chronic chaos of Spanish administration :

The government of this monarchy has been for above an age running into abuses and overgrown with weeds . . . wch occasioned ye downfall of both military and maritime vertue, while corruption and delay ruled in the judicatures, oppression upon ye people and theft and fraud upon the revenue both here and in ye Indyes. During all this time the Grandees forced themselves into authority by their birth and possessions ; and the Prince had no fence against them but by giving all the power and favour he could to persons of the lowest kind, drawn from being clerks out of the several offices. These sons of earth . . . tho' putt into high place to counterpoise ye insolent power of the Grandees, stood in perpetual awe of them and chose rather to make their fortunes by fishing in troubled waters than to putt themselves in any hazard by endeavouring at a reformation.

During the present King's reign, he continues, several earnest attempts had been made to introduce some order into the government of the country, but each reforming minister had fallen a victim to intrigue before his plans could be perfected. As for Alberoni, though his designs were vast, yet

the inside of his administration was hollow and incapable of being long supported, because everything was undertaken by fits and starts . . . nor was justice administered strictly and speedily nor offices cleansed of pick-pocketts.

Ripperda has now taken all the offices of State save one into his own hands, has enquired into former malversations, reformed the currency, cut down many unnecessary expenses and given orders for the punctual payment of the troops.

If Heaven [he concludes] grants ye King and Minister time enough to putt into execution the reform of government they have so much at heart . . . this Monarchy, which has been in leading strings this great while, may yet perhaps become the most considerable in Europe.

A subsequent letter, however, mentions Ripperda's growing unpopularity. And hard upon this follows another in which he speaks of Ripperda's disgrace and treachery :

It is but too plain that if our Master's friends transacted anything of moment with him he will not stick at making the discovery in order to make his court with those whose protection he has impudently had recourse to.*

The only crumb of comfort Wogan can extract from these events is the fact that henceforth he will have to deal with men of proved integrity like Castellar, de la Paz and Patino. No letters of his of any consequence are now to be found in the *Stuart Papers* during the next years, though one of 6 September, 1739, shows him to have been still in fairly constant correspondence with Rome. The gap is filled to some extent, however, by the letters exchanged between 1732 and 1735 with Dean Swift.

Their correspondence began with the receipt by Swift of a present of Spanish wine and of a green velvet bag,

* Ripperda, on being dismissed from office, had taken refuge with Mr. Stanhope, British Minister in Madrid, to whom he disclosed all the secrets of the Cabinet. Subsequently arrested, he escaped from prison, and after a while went to England and thence to Morocco, where he declared himself a Mohammedan.

in which were enclosed, with a dedicatory epistle, "several original pieces in verse and prose". The anonymous sender begged Swift, if he should think them worthy of his attention, to correct the manuscripts and cause them to be published, with such introductory remarks as he might see fit to make. Unfortunately both the MSS and the covering letter have disappeared in quite recent years*—a deplorable loss, inasmuch as Swift, who was not wont to say what he did not mean, assured the author, whose identity he soon discovered, that with these writings he had "often entertained some very ingenious friends" as well as himself.

I mean [he added], not only your poetry in Latin and English, but your poetical history in prose of your own life and actions, inscribed to me; which I have often wished it were safe to print here, or in England, under the madness of universal party now reigning: I mean particularly in this kingdom, to which I would prefer living among the Hottentots, if it were in my power.

Inasmuch as the correspondence can be read at length in Sir Walter Scott's edition of *Dean Swift's Works*, I shall say no more of it here, than that Wogan's long letter of 27 February, 1733, gives perhaps the best picture we possess of the sentiments and sufferings of the Wild Geese, as well as of those of their kinsmen, the Catholics of Ireland, during the "dark night" of the Penal days.

On the conclusion of the Moorish War in the following year, Wogan returned to Madrid, where he spent two years soliciting the military promotion to which his recent services and previous promises so justly entitled him. Disappointed of his hopes, and finding the command of his regiment given over his head to a junior, he then withdrew to Barcelona; whither the widowed Lady Misset and the faithful Jeanneton had preceded him. Just before this, Ormonde, who was leaving Spain, had recommended him for appointment as "Minister

* In 1913, according to a note to Mr. Elrington Balls' Edition of *Swift's Letters*, they were in the possession of the late Dr. O'Dea, Lord Bishop of Galway and Kilmacduagh. But, though the present Bishop's secretary has most kindly caused a search to be made in the Diocesan archives both at Galway and Loughreagh, no trace of them has so far been discovered.

Incognito" to the Spanish King. But James was obliged to reject the proposal, being, as he wrote in reply, "so low at present in money matters" that he could meet none but the most necessary expenses.

At Barcelona, accordingly, Wogan was still living in retirement when, to his great delight, he was suddenly appointed Governor of La Mancha. Nothing could have been more appropriate, for, as he wrote to King James :

One would think that Providence designed me from my birth for a Knight Errant and . . . seems not by caprice or chance but in pure justice . . . to have preferred me in my advanced age* to this post which lays the renowned Toboso itself and all the Dulcinea's thereto belonging under my jurisdiction, However . . . I beg yr. Majesty to be persuaded I have no sort of ambition to lay my bones near my noble predecessor Don Quixote's. I should have a better estate than ever his Fathers enjoyed and a tomb too where no man of honour need be ashamed to lye.† Thus I entreat yr. Majesty not to forget me here whenever kind Providence gives the call. I am but five and twenty when any occasion can offer to serve your Majesty.

A letter written on 8-9 December, 1744 to Lord Inverness has a characteristically racy account of the installation ceremony.

My dr. friend,

You'll be surprised without doubt at the date of this letter from the very capital of Don Quixote's Country. You are to know then that the 28th of last month I was solemnly installed as Corregidor or Supreme magistrate of all this country in a chair of State with a white wand in my right hand. Among the number of Dons that carryed the very air and mien of their famous ancestor was one in the particular of face, figure and gait of the much renowned hero with a red wigg on. Then wanted nothing but the lance and Mambrino's helmet (wh. to be sure he keeps among the archives of his family) to make him the completest copy that ever was made from an original. For my part, if I had not clapt a padlock on my mouth and forced my countenance into a seriousness that was far from my heart, I should have burst out into laughter and ruined myself by the loss of my new title that is worth to

* He was now in his sixtieth year by my computation.

† This was, no doubt, the old family burying-ground at Clane, Co. Kildare, between Rathcoffey and Clongowes.

me about 500*£* a year, with much authority, a little chariot to take the air in and a decent and easy way of living in a very cheap country. I wish you very heartily a happy New Year . . . being with the truest regard and friendship

Yr. own,

Chas. Wogan.

The call of which Wogan spoke in his letter to the King was not long in coming. Some eighteen months later, in July 1745, just before shipping off from Belle Isle with the two small ships furnished by his friend Walsh, the Irish merchant, Prince Charles Edward despatched Mr. Stafford to Madrid to solicit aid from Philip V. At the same time he sent a message to Wogan, directing the latter to co-operate with Stafford and Sir Thomas Geraldine and to take command of such troops as might be enlisted in Spain. This message was six weeks on the way, so that Wogan, posting off the same night to Madrid, expected to find the business concluded. To his amazement he found it not yet begun. For the Minister, Villarias, had "fallen ill of a sore leg and could not go to the Royall apartment to deliver the Princes' letters", and when these had at length been "very graciously received" it was thought necessary, before coming to any decision, to sound the Court of France. A courier was accordingly despatched to Paris and presently returned with an answer "very agreeable to the dispositions of their C.C.M.M.S, after whose example King Louis resolved to square his own conduct, and to give our Prince succours and supplyes in the same proportion as they were furnished from hence".

Accordingly, on the night of 4 August ("for all business of any moment is done here only at night"), Wogan had a long interview with the Minister "the result of which", he wrote to James from St. Ildefonso,

both pleas'd and surpris'd me. A hundred thousand crowns were ordered to be furnished and ten thousand arms distributed in 4 small frigates Each frigate, besides the proportion of money and arms, is to putt on board 500 quintals of powder and 600 of ball and lead* and some Irish officer on board such as I may appoint.

* This supply was later increased to 2000 quintals of each.

But after this fair beginning the usual heart-breaking delays occurred. For the Spanish Government, in spite of all that Wogan could say or do, obstinately refused to allow the expedition to start until from their own Ministers at The Hague and Paris they should be assured how the Prince had been received in Great Britain.

And I believe [wrote Wogan in a later letter to James,] the news was in Persia before it came from them at last about the middle of September.

It was not until 8 October that the first frigate was allowed to sail, and then only to fall a prey three days later to a Bristol Privateer. Of the remainder (as Horace Walpole informed Sir Horace Mann on 21 October), one was lost on the Irish coast, while another—wrongly supposed by him to have on board “Lord John Drummond and some people of quality”—safely reached Scotland. The fate of the fourth seems to be unknown.

These succours and a subsidy of 40,000 livres a month for the payment of 2000 men appear to be the sum of Spanish assistance to Charles Edward—assistance which yet compares very favourably with that given by the French Government, which thus lost, by its timidity, its last chance of seating a friendly monarch upon the throne of these islands.

As for Wogan himself, he had hoped to be among the first to sail. But towards the end of August zeal and anxiety brought on a violent attack of fever and jaundice; and the end of November found him still confined to the walls of a monastery. Bitterly as he regretted his enforced inaction, it was doubtless for him a lucky illness, for had he been taken prisoner—as was poor Stafford on board the first frigate—his Spanish commission would hardly have saved him from the fate that befell his former companion in Newgate, Charles Radcliffe, last Earl of Derwentwater, who, after thirty years of exile, was soon to suffer in the same manner as had his elder brother in 1716.

Meanwhile, Wogan busied himself to the utmost extent his physical infirmity permitted, in soliciting further aid

from Philip, by whom he was assured that what had been done was but an earnest of greater things to come. We find him also again engaged upon his earlier rôle of match-maker ; the match upon which he had set his heart being nothing less than one between the Prince of Wales and the youngest Infanta. His "hints underhand", he tells James, "have been very agreeably taken". Their C.C.M.M.S. are extremely well inclined. In their private conversation "they speak with great gayety of Galien" (their pet name for a Prince) "and their young Hero, and she of her nephew à la mode de Bretagne." As for the young lady, he has "put Mrs. Lacy, her governante, and her favourite cameriste Miss O'Moore into ye humour on't" ; while his "stepdaughter O.D." keeps the Queen informed of all that passes. These advances are, he explains, made only for the good of the cause and bind no one but himself. Nevertheless, he ventures to assure his master that the Infanta

is one of ye charmingest brunettes in Europe, of the finest size and shape, dances and sings to perfection, has a vast deal of wit and vivacity, an excellent education, and more charms, in my opinion, than the celebrated Dauphine with her great white and long face.

Yet these things, as he candidly confessed, were "but accessoryes and sharing ye spoyles before they are got". So, alas, it proved. Notwithstanding the extraordinary success that attended Charles Edward's earlier campaign and the very real hope that with sufficient foreign assistance a Restoration would be effected, performances of Spanish promises was still "in the Anabaptist way". So some time in the early spring of 1746 Wogan must have finally despaired of overcoming the inertia of Madrid ; for we next hear of him in France with the Duke of York, watching for an opportunity of joining the Prince in Scotland. It was not to be. Less than ten days later the cause went down for ever on Culloden Moor, and the army he had sought to join became a rout of helpless fugitives given over to the tender mercies of Butcher Cumberland.

Our last sight of him is afforded by a letter to the King dated from Arras on 13 July, 1746; its sad, stark simplicity contrasting notably with the exuberance of his habitual style :

Sir : 'Tis with a sorrowful heart I doe myself the honour to inform your Majesty of my departure this day for Madrid ; there being no further encouragement for the affair I came about, and having received orders from the Court of Spain to return to my employment there. All this goes to my heart, and it would be wrong in me to afflict your Majesty with a recital of my grief. Your Majesty has surer accounts from other hands of the way our Prince is in ; and may be persuaded that as long as God lends me life, I shall always be equally ready to doe what service I can for the Cause I ever had soe much at heart. Being with the most invincible zeal and duty, Sir,

Your Majesty's
Most dutiful and faithful servant,
Chas. Wogan.

Two and thirty years of his life had been given to the cause. It is fitting that his last recorded words should be addressed to the King he served.

HUGH A. LAW.

JOSEPH DE MAISTRE*

THREE is perhaps nothing in the life of St. Thomas More requiring more delicate treatment than the definition of his attitude towards the Papacy. His conversation in 1521 with the King, his impulsive words to Bonvisi with their subsequent recall, his cautious considered statement in his letter to Cromwell, all need to be given their respective values if we are to discover the full content of his mind upon the matter. It is not, however, my business tonight to attempt any such difficult enterprise. I am only concerned to remind you that in a country where the most part of the Episcopate were as trumpets giving an uncertain sound, the saint in him enabled him to perceive with increasing confidence, which ultimately, if not always, satisfied the claims of certitude, the vital truth that the Chair of St. Peter cannot be displaced without infidelity from the centre of the Church nor without insularity from the tribune of Christendom. About the precise relationship between Pope and Council, as about the precise sphere in which papal infallibility obtains, his views continued vague. The Church had yet to define what the faithful ought to believe.

It might have been expected that this requirement would have been met at the Council of Trent. With a statesmanship, however, that cannot be too highly commended the Fathers of that assembly left over for decision in a calmer hour the burning issue of the Papal claims ; and it can never, therefore, with justice be said that the problem of reunion was complicated by untimely action on the side of the Church. Not until the Reformation had given birth to that catastrophic movement which bears *par excellence* the name of the Revolution—not, that is, until the Holy See had been challenged all along the line of its authority, both spiritual and temporal, as the guarantor of supernatural religion and the guardian of Christian morals—was the question of the nature and extent of its infallible powers brought up for settlement.

* A paper read in substance to the St. Thomas More Society on 4 March, 1938.

I am to attempt this evening to interest you a little in the remarkable man who has been styled, not only "the Catholic Voltaire" but also "the preface to the Vatican Council"; who, in respect of the cause for which St. Thomas died, has proved the most influential layman since the Martyr's time; and who is not without a touch of the broad mysticism, to be seen in St. Thomas himself, which comes of contact between a pious mind and great affairs. In England indeed his name is little known; nor has he, who, with a better knowledge of Locke and Bacon than of Burke, declared that the beginning of political wisdom is to be found in the contempt of English ideas,* any cause to complain of it. Yet John Morley towards the close of last century singled Maistre out as pre-eminently representative, not only of that "remarkable Catholic reaction . . . in France" which, as he observed, "had never received in England the attention . . . it deserved", but of the whole school of thought with which the rationalistic Liberalism of last century was in conflict. Morley's essay was, as might be expected, written with all the amiable condescension of enlightenment triumphing over obscurantism. But one may be permitted to wonder, when its author and its subject meet, as I trust they do, in the Elysian fields, what passes between them now. For the orb of the Papacy still rides high in the heavens, but to discover the Liberal Party one has to search Europe, and even England, with candles. So often do the weak things of this world, and the things that are despised, confound the things that are mighty!

What interested Morley—himself, as has been admirably said, "an inverted theologian"—in Joseph de Maistre was, doubtless, the religious and political harmonies of a mind from which, with his susceptibility to French influences, he differed rather in opinion than in temper. "Throughout his book on the Pope," he observes, "De Maistre talks of Christianity exclusively as a statesman or a publicist would talk of it: not theologically or spiritually but politically and socially." In other words the champion of the *ancien régime*

* *Oeuvres*, xii, p. 476.

régime had engaged the spirit of rationalism with its own weapons and on its own soil—with political experience, that is to say, and upon the field of history.

Joseph de Maistre was born at Chambéry in 1753, a native of Savoy, though coming of an old French family from Languedoc. Time and circumstance have dealt harshly with “the delectable Duchy” where he had his home, tearing it from its ancient rulers to make it part of the price of French support in the struggle for Italian unity. But the neighbourhood of Chambéry with its wealth of lake and mountain remains, if not so entrancingly beautiful as when Rousseau made it the basis of a new taste in scenery,* at least lovely beyond the power of man wholly to destroy. Not, of course, that the fine gentlemen of the eighteenth century had any use for it! Horace Walpole, the elegant product of a period to which Rousseau set a bound, dilates upon the uncouth rocks and uncomely inhabitants of this neighbourhood and declares the town of Chambéry to be no better than “a little nasty, old hole”,† which Beckford endorses by observing that it is very little worth mention, being “full of Piedmontese officers and smarts, or such as would be so, if they could”, and possessing “vile, dirty streets and ill-built convents; fat, lazy monks and sauntering abbés, in short all kinds of cupidity”.‡

These, however, were but surface appearances. Beneath lay a rich vein of gold and the best amenities of the century. “If there is a small town in the world”, declares Rousseau, “where one tastes the sweetness of living in intercourse at once agreeable and certain, it is Chambéry.”§ Society in that golden age of conversation was true to its purpose, did really assemble to exchange ideas and discuss interesting things. It believed in fact as firmly that miracles could be wrought by talk as the Middle Age had believed that they were worked by solitude and silence. And Maistre in this opening phase of his life was swept along, as all healthy-minded youth is supposed to be, by sentimental currents. He acclaimed America, just then emerging into independence, as the

* Conf., I, 4.

† Melville, *Life of Beckford*, p. 53.

‡ Letters, 11 November, 1739.

§ Conf., I, 5.

guardian of liberty,* acquired the reputation of a dangerous young man and, though since 1738 Catholics were forbidden to join Masonic Societies, paid so little heed to Rome as to figure locally as a prominent Mason.†

Upon this connection of his with Freemasonry a good deal of the perennial interest which he attracts has recently been focused. A memorandum that he addressed on the subject to the Duke of Brunswick in 1782 has lately been published,‡ and the effect of it is to establish a point of contact between his membership of the Masonic lodges of Chambéry and the religious and political convictions that made him subsequently famous. It seems clear that what attracted him in the Masonic mysteries was precisely that perception of the symbolic nature of things which makes him say somewhere that Plato is always ahead of us on the road to truth; whilst what he hoped of them in practice may be inferred from his scheme of three grades in Masonry—the lowest occupied with works of beneficence; the next with the tutelage of kings and the reunion of Christendom; the highest charged with the rational study and exposition of the mysteries of faith. It is, however, profoundly significant of the ultimate association of these ideas that he sees them as converging upon a centre at Jerusalem and not as localized in Rome.§

Indication as it was rather of intellectual vivacity than of spiritual orientation, this phase of its existence did no enduring harm to a soul formed by the piety of a Savoyard Monica and trained by the supreme educators of that time—the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. In Chambéry, besides, the music of the Middle Age still lingered. Sights were to be seen, and sounds heard, born of another world than ours—the call of the Angelus at twilight, when in *château* and *salon* and *chaumière* the inhabitants, all alike, would uncover and cross themselves for prayer;|| the figures of the cowled, bare-footed “*Pénitents Noirs*

* *Eloge de Victor-Amedée III* (Descotes, *Joseph de Maistre avant la Révolution*, p. 31).

† *Oeuvres*, IX, p. 39.

‡ *Joseph de Maistre. "La Franc-Maçonnerie"*. Mem. Inéd., 1782. (Paris, 1925.) Edit. Emile Dermenghem.

§ Vermale, *Joseph de Maistre, Emigré*, p. 122.

|| Descotes, *Joseph de Maistre*, I, p. 212.

de Savoie" among whom Maistre himself was enrolled,* discharging the corporal works of mercy ; and, away up in the hills, if one strayed so far, the vision of those "silent courts, where, night and day, Into their stone-carved basins cold, The splashing icy fountains play . . ." ; of those "humid corridors, Where, ghostlike in the deepening night, Cowl'd forms brush by in gleaming white"†—the vision, in short, of the famed Monastery of the Grande Chartreuse.

I should be wandering too far from my way if I were to attempt to contrast the significance for society of the Carthusian ideal with the ultimate meaninglessness of revolutionary doctrine. I must leave it to Mr. Aldous Huxley to argue, as he does in his latest book on *Means and Ends*, that the Marquis de Sade is, philosophically speaking, the representative revolutionist and to say, in so many words, that "Sade's books are of permanent interest and value because they contain a kind of *reductio ad absurdum* of revolutionary theory". Yet, before we leave the mountains of Savoy, it seems pertinent to suggest that only in these high altitudes can we perceive the deepest difference between the spirit of the Revolution and the spirit of the ancient order. Whilst communism of one kind or another is the property of both alike—for the monks were no individualists—there is a great gulf fixed between Les Charmettes, where Rousseau had once lived with Mme. de Warens, almost at the gates of Chambéry, and the Grande Chartreuse in the mountains behind—a gulf as great as the equalitarian's belief that he is as good as, if not better than his neighbour is distant from the monkish recipe for progress which I take from the *Imitatio Christi* : "Never think", says Thomas à Kempis, "that thou hast thyself made any advance until thou dost feel thyself inferior to all." In those words is latent a scheme of sociology compatible with a universe, hierarchically organized, so far as we can see, in every part, yet capable, by the simple expedient of including humility amongst civic virtues, of investing the principle of inequality with far lovelier colouring than ever that of equality can wear. The *Ancien Régime* had

* *Ibid.*, p. 92.

† M. Arnold. *Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse*.

indeed perceived this all too little ; but the Revolution did not perceive it at all.

It would be tempting, if time allowed, to contemplate in detail the quiet charm of the eventful years during which Maistre pursued, with much promise of distinction, the same learned profession in which his father by an admirable codification of the laws of Savoy* had attained high eminence. It would be pleasant, if space allowed, to enlarge upon the two great friendships of his life—that with the younger Salteur, whose incisive conversation was to bear fruit years afterwards in Maison's famous *Soirées de St. Petersbourg*,† and that with Henri Costa de Beauregard, an anti-type of Bayard in courage, courtesy, patriotism, hopefulness ; to speak of the domestic virtues of "Mme. Prudence"‡ as he called her—née Mad.^{me} de Morand—whom Maistre, by virtue of the law of contraries, had chosen as his wife ; or again to recover in imagination the long autumn holidays spent at lovely Beauregard above the Lake of Geneva. Here are charming vignettes ; yet the spirit of Maistre will never pass before us whilst we gaze at them. His was a nature that needed storm and whirlwind, cliff and snow and mountain eyrie to prove its strength of sight and wing. In these early years he was apt to be oppressed by the flatness of his life, the narrowness of his work, by the heaviest, perhaps, of all weights, for which he himself has found an immortal name "*l'énorme poids du rien*".§ Time with its most brutal irony was to correct these minor troubles. To him, as to many at least amongst us, it fell to behold a Titanic upheaval and to see the four horsemen of the Apocalypse ride across the stage of human life. In the isolation of his Russian mission|| and again in the closing reaches of his life¶ he looked back upon the peace and quiet of his early years and knew them for what they really were.

Savoy lay right in the path of the French Revolution.

* The code of 1770 was his work in conjunction with Salteur, the First President of the Senate.

† Descotes, *Joseph de Maistre avant la Révolution*, I, p. 156.

‡ *Oeuvres*, X, p. 206.

§ *Oeuvres*, IX, p. 332.

|| "Le tout est grand mais je suis seul."—*Oeuvres*, IX, p. 332.

¶ *Oeuvres*, XIII, p. 314.

Montesquieu overran the country, firing the madness of change that was in so many men of that time as if it had been a train of gunpowder. Maistre fled, but only to return in the hope of preserving his property by a passive submission to the new order of things. But that *souffre de Provence** in him—that Provençal explosiveness which he had of his father—would not suffer it. He refused to pay the war tax and fled again, this time to Lausanne.

Lac Leman, or at least its northern shore, was even yet a witch's cauldron of seething thoughts. Voltaire had but lately passed from thence to his long home ; Gibbon was only then preparing for that last journey to England from which he never returned ; Rivarol, one of the four sages of whom it has been said that they understood the scope and meaning of the Revolution from the first,† was still to be seen there, and likewise Mallet du Pan, an admirable man whose balanced counsels had as little effect as is usual in an unbalanced world. From the security of Coppet, Necker still watched the Revolution which he had been powerless to stem. And Madame de Staél was there with her father, talking incessantly to the amazement and sometimes the discomfort of those that met her. Maistre, in face of her eloquence, is said‡ to have made use of one of his natural advantages—a certain ungovernable tendency to drop quietly asleep. But at times he fell before the magic of her talent and confessed she would have been adorable if she had only undergone a Catholic discipline.§

It was amid such surroundings that Maistre put together a body of reflections which, under the title of *Considérations sur la France*, became the Bible of the emigrés. His political, like his ecclesiastical, doctrine might be described as a rationalized blend of monarchy and mysticism. He sees in the growth of an ordered society the hand of God. A country, a constitution, a patriotic tradition—all this appears to him neither the work of chance, nor yet, as the ideologues of his time

* *Oeuvres*, IX, p. 7.

† Taine. The others were Malouet, Gouverneur Morris, Mallet du Pan. (See B. Mallet's *Mallet du Pan*, from which I take the reference.)

‡ Cogordan, *Joseph de Maistre*, p. 28.

§ *Oeuvres*, XIV, p. 143.

would have maintained, of artifice, but rather something mystical in nature and of Divine appointment. We are born, he perceives, into our social inheritance, and in the use we make of it we have to seek, not our own will, but the will of God. The soul of a people is for him an undying fire that comes straight from Heaven. We have to watch it so that it may burn bright and clear ; to warm ourselves in its glow ; then, when our time is come, to pass it on in faith and love to our children. And for this vestal vigil the essential quality is what Maistre boldly styles "prejudice"—not of course in the sense of ideas known to be false, but in that of ideas not judicially examined. "Man," he says, "to guide himself aright, has need, not of problems but of beliefs."* For him as for the most part of his contemporary disciples the tradition of faith seemed to postulate the protection of a throne. Of the three classical forms of government he holds that monarchy, just because it is the least artificial, does in fact satisfy best the native instincts of humanity. "One can say, generally speaking," he argues, "that all men are born for monarchy."† And it might prove harder than we sometimes think to refute his doctrine. Only with effort can a common mind conceive sovereignty as lodged elsewhere than in a personal ruler ; whilst even a brilliant mind, like Disraeli's, can double the glamour of politics and draw half the inspiration of policy from investing his sovereign with the style of an Oriental Empress and the attributes of a Fairy Queen. Democracy, when all has been said, is ultimately dull ; and in this country, with its matchless powers of make-believe, we are careful to safeguard our devotion to it by lavish distributions of titles, much royal activity and as many monarchical shows as circumstances permit. No society, for the rest, knows how to get on without some sort of a figurehead ; and in France, upon which Maistre has especially fixed his eye, there still exists—to quote the words of a once-noted English student of all things French†—"a chronic yearning to acclaim a chief" ; and this in spite of a list of sorry pretenders to the seat and

* *Oeuvres*, I, p. 375.

† Bodley, *France*, I, p. 297.

Vol. 203

† *Oeuvres*, I, p. 424.

succession of "*le Grand Monarque*", in whom the genius of the French Monarchy had seemed to Maistre incarnate. "*Le Siècle de Louis XIV*"—there for him was to be found the picture of a constitution as it ought to be ; there he perceived (despite those Gallican Articles of 1682 which he attributes to the influence of Mme. de Maintenon) a satisfying blend of religion with chivalry, genius, amiability and gallantry ; there he found such a close grouping of the nobles about the throne as enabled him to argue with plausibility that "monarchy is only aristocracy centralized".* Thus it was natural enough that the great catastrophe of his time in France should take for him the apocalyptic colours of a national apostacy. "All that we see", he will write presently to Blacas, "is only a religious revolution. The rest, which seems immense, is no more than an appendix. The King of France was at the head of the religious system of Europe ; he was the Temporal Pope ; and the Catholic Church is a kind of ellipse, having one hearth at Rome, the other at Paris."†

It says much for Maistre's political insight that in this early phase of the Revolution he should have issued a forecast of events which, in view of its detailed accuracy, must be reckoned one of the most extraordinary prophecies that history records. "Everything announces", he wrote, "that the order of things established in France cannot last and that invincible Nature will restore the monarchy. . . . The people go for nothing in revolutions, or at least only take part in them as passive instruments. Four or five persons, perhaps, will give a king to France. Letters from Paris will announce to the provinces that France has a king ; and the provinces will cry '*Vive le roi*'. . . . The people, if monarchy is restored, will no more decree its restoration than they decreed its destruction or the establishment of the revolutionary government."‡ Some fifteen or more years later—in 1814—these words were fulfilled almost to the letter, when from a room in Paris Alexander

* *Oeuvres*, I, p. 430.

† Daudet, *Maistre and Blacas*. *Corresp. Méd.*, p. 125.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 112 and 113.

of Russia and Talleyrand, sitting in council with Schwarzenberg and Frederick William of Prussia, decreed the restoration of the Bourbons. But there was more in their proceedings than the uncanny fulfilment of the letter of a prophecy. They acted in the hope that the great truth with which Maistre had declared that the French could not saturate themselves too much, would be fulfilled. "The re-establishment of the monarchy which men call counter-revolution"—thus he had concluded his reflections—"will not be a contrary revolution (*une révolution contraire*) but the contrary of a revolution."

It would be, he meant, without violence, vengeance, agitation—not so much the restoration to the country of former things, but a renewal of its old sense of well-being, stability and repose. Here was a very profound, a very statesmanlike saying; and we need not be astonished to see Berdyaev, who in our own day has found a use for some tattered pieces of Maistre's prophetic mantle, throwing it into great prominence. A restoration, to succeed, must in truth be not a contrary revolution, but precisely the contrary of a revolution—not merely reminiscent of the past, but a corrective of its mistakes, its negligences and its ignorances.

A glimpse of Maistre about this time, of which a record has come down to us, crystallizes this prophetic aspect of his personality as it revealed itself to those who knew him best. In the company of Henri Costa, now an exile and bereaved of his only son, Maistre had crossed Lac Leman to pay a stolen visit to ruined Beauregard, the haunt of happier times. As the boat drew towards land, he raised himself and, whilst the sun inflamed with its declining rays the wasted and blackened pile which they had come to see, descended to his desolate companion upon the awful mysteries of vicarious punishment.* Scott, amongst the great writers then alive, might have done the fullest justice to the speaker, the theme and the occasion, which seems indeed at first sight to desiderate some bleak, northern expanse of pine and heather rather than the kindlier shores of the Lake of

* Costa de Beauregard, *Un Homme d'Autrefois*.

Geneva. But such a thought is transient. Chance had mixed the elements of the scene more subtly. The stern, prophetic figure, unable even in that melancholy hour to subdue the burning thoughts that were to make his fame, is best outlined against the soft background of a sunlit lake where, like the furies that rationalism conceals beneath its surface-smoothness, storms lie sleeping.

The problem of pain and of Providence had in fact begun by force of circumstances to occupy Maistre's mind; and Lord Morley is probably justified in thinking that his treatment of it was largely affected by the particular experience of adversity that the years of Revolution brought him. "The universe", he was one day to write to Bonald, "is full of just punishments of which the agents are most guilty."*

A few months after the scene at Beauregard he had been summoned to Turin by the King of Sardinia. Charles-Emmanuel IV was not among the greater princes of the House of Savoy; whilst the times required resources of character and intellect beyond the common. For about a year he fortified sand-castles against the advancing tide of the revolutionary armies, then forsook Piedmont and took refuge in Sardinia. Maistre likewise fled, but to Venice. Taking his wife and children with him, he made a wild escape down the Po in all the rigour of winter and between the batteries of the opposing armies which threatened them from either bank. The end, however, was not yet.

The successes of Suvarov provided a St. Luke's Summer for Charles-Emmanuel's fortunes. During that brief restoration Maistre was appointed Regent of the Sardinian Chancery. He had been put in charge of an Augean stable, and his work admitted of zeal but not of zest. Apparently Prince Charles-Felix, the Viceroy—a stiff-backed supporter of all ancient things, evil as well as good—found him inconveniently active,† and so, when Charles-Emmanuel turned Jesuit after Napoleon's victory at Marengo and Victor-Emmanuel took over

* "L'univers est rempli de supplices très justes dont les exécuteurs sont très coupables" (to Bonald).—*Lettres et Opusc.*, I, p. 519.

† See Mandoul, *Un Homme d'Etat Italien*, p. 58.

what was now no more than the shadow of a kingdom, he was sent to represent his sovereign at Petersburg. His wife and children had already, for financial reasons, returned to Savoy, and he went alone, taking with him in truth not much more in the way of credentials than his own striking presence and engaging personality.

We must imagine him now under the stress of life developing that mass of white hair which, taken in conjunction with a mouth slightly ironical yet "formed for eloquence", caused a Sicilian acquaintance to compare his features to Etna with her crown of snows above and her volcanic flames beneath. His brow was broad; his nose aquiline; his figure tall; while his eyes, alert yet softened by a slight dreaminess, which may have been no more than an effect of his very short sight, seemed to be looking for something beyond the world of sense. He had the gift of making himself agreeable to women and could use it on occasion to professional purpose. He was to be found in certain salons of Petersburg; almost daily at the Princess Wiasemski's and often at Mme. Swetchine's—that charming Russian convert, whose receptions in the Catholic world of Paris were at a later date to become famous and who owed some part of her conversion to this early friendship. Yet, with all this, he shows the sort of disdain which all the apparatus of society is, rather unreasonably, apt to excite in a man of intellectual tastes and high ideals. "I serve the King by wasting my time," he complains to a friend.* His desperate poverty doubtless added weight to the shackles of every petty convention. He had to endure the slings and arrows of a penury so acute that he was obliged to engage a criminal for a servant and to deprive himself of the most ordinary conveniences of life to equip his son for a commission in the Russian Imperial Guard.† The remembrance of happier things—of his childhood at Chambéry; of the mother whom he had so greatly venerated; of those friends who had been frozen away by what he calls "*le glaçon de la grande place*"‡—the icicle of great place—made their contribution to his

* *Oeuvres*, IX, p. 240, cp. p. 361.

† *Ibid.*, X, p. 300.

‡ *Ibid.*, IX, p. 335.

suffering. Such miseries, however, were not insupportable. What pained him most was his separation from his youngest child, Constance, who had never known him. "The idea of this orphan daughter of a living father", he wrote, "crucifies me: all the rest I can bear."* He covered these piercing regrets, however, with a bold face, wrote entertaining letters to his correspondents, and, for the rest, fled from his narrow circumstances to the vast palace of his mind. Better than most men he exemplified the truth of the lines which Goethe had but lately set down :

Who never eat his bread in sorrow,
Who never spent the darksome hours
Weeping and watching for the morrow,
He knows ye not, ye Heavenly Powers.

Lonely,† with failing sight,‡ unappreciated by his sovereign, reduced to practise the most humiliating economies,§ the Minister of a state which had shrunk into an island, Maistre yet contrived to maintain his position, to gain an influence at the Court to which he was accredited, to secure the consideration even of the Napoleonic envoys, Savary and Caulaincourt,|| and in a word to prove for the millionth time that character can redeem the most adverse situation. He was always at work, for the vile climate of Petersburg happened to suit him admirably.¶ Social duties were the least of his labours. When the splendid inanities of society were done, he would return from the great world to his own humble quarters, there to pursue his ecclesiastical studies or indite his diplomatic despatches. These last have become famous. Written in cipher, but in a cipher of which the author was aware that the Russian Government stood possessed, they are not so much reports intended for the eye of his own sovereign as counsels insinuated into the ear of the sovereign to whom he was accredited. Alexander was certainly, if it came to that, more worthy of Maistre's attention than Victor-

* *Ibid.*, IX, p. 130.

† *Ibid.*, IX, p. 369.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 375 and 383.

§ *Ibid.*, XI, p. 503; X, p. 104.

|| *Ibid.*, X, p. 510; XI, p. 536.

¶ *Ibid.*, IX, p. 371.

Emmanuel. Not only did he enjoy the substance of power, but, also, his policy was apt to follow the shadowy leadings of religious mysticism. Maistre had that in him to arrest the eye of the imperial visionary; and he exercised a growing influence over Alexander's mind.

Intellectually, it might be argued, the lot had fallen to him in a fair ground. Not the ruler only, but the country also, fitted into his philosophy and stimulated his thoughts. The fascination of Russia—its great size and stature and strength;* the awful homelessness of its snow-clad steppes, destined, before the Revolution ended, to become the tomb of thousands of French soldiers, whose appalling fate seemed to him the most direct of the judgements of God;† the contrast between its grey, artificial capital upon the Neva, and original many-coloured metropolis at Moscow, where in the Kremlin the Muscovite genius lay slumbering;‡ and last but not least for him, the strange susceptibility of the country to French influences§—these things we know were present to his mind, as was also a prophetic uneasiness as to what the intense, wilful, passionate people|| among whom he lived might do, if they should ever be roused from their hungry torpor.¶

His interest in their future was presumably intensified by the fact that in 1809, through a singular chain of circumstance, he became their compatriot. It happened in this way. Alexander's volte-face at Tilsit, where enmity towards Napoleon was suddenly exchanged for friendship, had the incidental effect of converting the Sardinian Minister into a French emigré. Savoy, that is to say, was accepted by the Russian Government as being part of France, and a Savoyard consequently became the subject of Napoleon. Add to this the inconvenience that peace with France meant a breach of

* "Je suis au milieu de tout ce qu'il y a de plus grand dans l'univers."—*Œuvres*, IX, p. 176.

† "Je crois que Dieu n'a jamais dit aux hommes d'une voix plus haute et plus distincte, 'C'est moi'."—*Œuvres*, XII, p. 344.

‡ *Œuvres*, XII, p. 281.

§ "Le génie Français monte le génie Russe au pied de la lettre, comme l'homme monte le cheval."—*Œuvres*, XI, p. 520.

|| "Il n'y a point d'homme qui veuille aussi passionnément que le Russe."—*Œuvres*, VIII, p. 288.

¶ *Œuvres*, XII, pp. 218 and 282. Cp. XI, p. 375.

diplomatic relations with the King of Sardinia, and it is apparent that Maistre had somehow to regularize his position at Petersburg. He met the difficulty by causing himself to be naturalized as a Russian subject,* and it was in this new character that he became in 1812 the official editor of the Emperor's rescripts and in fact one of his ministers. The appointment followed upon a memorial which in the previous year he had been invited to draw up for the Emperor's consideration.

Maistre was himself, as we might expect, an unaffected believer in that older Russia, upon the natural genius of which Peter the Great had foisted the language and learning of the West, and even described that imperial innovator as the assassin of the Russian people and the opponent of its character and religion. We need not consequently be surprised to find him depicting the country of his adoption as the last stronghold of the Humanities which a secular Science was seeking to supplant, and pointing out his old tutors, the Jesuits, as bulwarks of the true philosophy of knowledge. He believed (and the belief is not perhaps so fanciful as it looks) that but for their suppression the Revolution would have been averted ; he regarded them as the only security against that wider revolution of thought and feeling which was tearing away all the anchorage of civilization ; and he removed mountains to secure the status and privileges of a university for their college at Polotsk. This singular diplomatic success was obtained in 1810 ; and it was in the following year that he drew up the memorial which, in the opinion of the best of his biographers, is the most biting of all diatribes against the modern spirit.† He speaks there of four things—the four last things (at any rate for the age in which he lived) in civic life—Liberty, Science, Religion, and Illuminism—and speaks of them as they affect and fashion that life.

Of Liberty he declares that it became practicable only with the appearance of Christianity and will decay if Christianity depart.‡ The reason of this is that man, if

* F. Vermale, *Joseph de Maistre, Emigré*, p. 106.

† Cogordan, *Joseph de Maistre*, p. 88.

‡ *Oeuvres*, VIII, pp. 279 and 283.

left to himself, is too wicked to be capable of freedom. The culture of Greece, the power of Rome rested in the last resort upon servitude. Religion and Slavery—these are the two anchors of social stability, and between these we have to choose. And, if the obvious question is put, "Why then is Orthodox Russia still a land of serfs?", his answer is that the forward march of Christian civilization has been retarded by causes ranging from the original antipathy between Rome and Constantinople down to the vices of the Popes.* "No sovereign power", he repeats with emphasis, "is strong enough to govern many millions of men unless it is aided by religion or slavery, one or the other." "One cannot", he adds, "insist too much upon a maxim which is as sure as a mathematical proposition. No great people can be governed by the government."† Liberty, in fact, is possible—and here Maistre advances perhaps the most daring of his anti-Liberal paradoxes—in exact proportion as the priesthood, the source and fountain of religion, is influential and respected.

ALGERNON CECIL.

* *Œuvres*, p. 284.

† *Ibid.*, p. 289.

THE JOURNAL OF PRIOR WILLIAM MORE OF WORCESTER

WI利IAM PEERS, alias More, was mitred Prior of Worcester from 1518 to 1536. During his term of office he kept a minute account of his household expenses. Receipts, memoranda and stray jottings are scattered among these accounts at haphazard and in a disconnected way, which must have made it very difficult to keep a businesslike record. These rolls are important, not only because they throw some light upon the character of one interesting figure in the history of the Reformation, but because they reveal to a certain extent the private and domestic life of a mediaeval prelate and the economics and accountancy practised in the Middle Ages. A sixteenth-century abbot—or in the case of a cathedral priory, prior—was not only the religious superior of a monastery, but a man of more or less influential temporal power: a great landowner, a member of the House of Lords, a man of law, lord of many manors and feudal baron with certain rights and privileges over his tenants. So the contemporary rolls of the accounts of such a notability must necessarily be full of items so diverse as to be of the greatest interest to students of monastic history. The accounts are drawn up in a mixture of Latin and English. Entries are made each week, unmethodically and without any assortment: expenses for food, travelling, vestments, work on the estate are just thrown together into one incredible amalgam. These hebdomadal lists are dated from some feastday which always marked the beginning of a new quarter, and are generally headed by some little tit-bit of interest, such as the place of residence, the visit of some celebrity, or his state of health. These are typical examples: "Ebdomada prima in festo sancti johannis baptiste at london." "Ebdomada sexta at worcester the princess maria being here." "Ebdomada prima post annunciaciōnem beate marie passion sonday. At grymley [one of his manors] being diseased this wycke."

At the end of each week the accountant makes out the sum total, and at the end of each quarter he adds them all up, thus :

Summa totius quarterii in expensis hospitii £17 13s. 1d.

Summa totius quarterii in solucionibus septimanatim £15 13s. 5d.

Spices bought this quarter 37s. 8*½*d.

Item—Wyne bought out of the towne as rede was this quarter 13s. 1d.

If we multiply by thirty to get its modern value, as up-to-date scholars say we should, we would find that this quarterly debit does not exceed that of a big land-owner of our own day.

What was his annual expenditure ? It may be conjectured from the following list, marked *Allocationes domini prioris*, which accounts for his expenses during one year :

- [In wages] : De quibus dictus dominus petit allocari pro stipendiis famulorum hospicii sui hoc anno £26 3s. 4d.
-
- Et pro vestura famulorum hospicii sui et aliorum amicorum . . . £20 os. od.
- [In food] : Et pro victualibus tam carnium quam piscium emptis et expenditis pro hospicio suo £81 6s. 8d.
- [In wine] : Et in vino amaro et ceteris condimentis 20s.
-
- Et in vino rubro albo et clarecto £26 13s. 4d.
- Et in vino dulce 70s. od.
- [Lighting] : Et in candelis 103s.
- [Travelling] : Et in expensis dicti domini prioris et servientium suorum equitantium ad diversa loca £13 6s. 8d.
-
- Et in herneseriis equinis ut in frenis et aliis necessariis ad equitandum emptis una cum ferrura equorum et diversorum drenches pro equis certis vicibus . . . £2 6s. 8d.
- [Charities] : Et in regardis datis scholaribus et fratribus predicatorum et minorum ac multis aliis extraneis provenientibus cum donis et muneribus diversis viribus hoc anno £10 os. od.
-
- Et in pane empto in villa data et distributa (sic) pauperibus ad festa principalia 13s. 4d.

[Work on
Estate] :

Et solutum diversis operariis pro rayles et pales
apud grymley hoc anno £6 16s od.

Et solutum diversis aliis operiis laborantibus circa
conductionem aquae apud Grymley Ashenshal
poole et in orto domini ac etiam in diversis
aliis locis hoc anno £2 5s. od.

[In clothing] : Et pro indumentis emptis ad usum corporis sui
hoc anno £10 0s. od.

Many other items are entered, including the price of a horse, rushes for the floors, wages of his tax-collector, kitchen utensils, etc. The accountant did not trouble to make a sum total, but it all amounts to £245 : 19 : 4; that is to say, well over £7,000 in modern currency. Seven thousand a year cannot be said to be an extravagant disbursement for a great estate-owner and man of position, who was forced by the circumstances in which he found himself not only to maintain a large household of his own in food, clothing and wages, but also to spend a considerable amount of his revenue in offering hospitality to persons of every rank, from princes to tramps. We must remember, however, that the *mensa abbatialis* (abbot's income) was distinct from the *mensa communis*, which was divided among the various officials of the monastery. It was this *mensa abbatialis* which was, on the Continent, appropriated by influential laymen and secular clerics in the hey-day of *commendam*; but in England (with one unique exception) it was used by the actual superior of the monastery. What was the private income of a sixteenth-century abbot? It is, of course, hard to generalize on this subject because all the monasteries were differently endowed and the abbots only appropriated a certain proportion of their revenues. Some were rich, some were very rich, and others found it difficult to keep up the external dignity which they considered due to their position. Worcester may be taken as a typical greater monastery at the time of the suppression, and the Prior's income for one year (1532) amounted to £276 18s. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. We may consider that sum to be roughly his annual income, though it is difficult to check this because the scribe does not often add up the accounts entered in his rolls; and when he does his results are

often inaccurate. We have seen that he spent about £246 a year, and received, chiefly in rents, the approximate sum of £277, which should leave him a margin of £31 a year to spend on the building or renovating of his manors, or the purchase of valuable vestments, plate and books. A study of the roll shows us that this is exactly what he did. Soon after his election he bought, for instance, a new mitre which cost him £50, or £1,500 in modern money. The rolls also mention "a hoole sewte of vestments of cletthe of golde, the ground red velvet—£90 18s. 4d.". He paid £5 for a cope of blue velvet "with oysters [ostrich?] fethers". But these large sums are found only infrequently in the lists, since his income, as we have seen, did not permit him to purchase such valuables except on rare occasions.

The Prior was literary. He was constantly buying new books. From his journal we can easily detect in what field of literature his tastes lay, and it is also interesting to note the cost of the books he purchased—books still in manuscript and others in printed editions. The Prior's literary tastes were almost exclusively historical, legal, patristic and ascetical. The first year of his rule he bought the works of St. Augustine for 50s.; five years later he makes a considerable addition to his library by bringing in the works of St. Jerome in five volumes, for which he paid 40s.; St. Ambrose in four volumes, 13s. 4d.; and "a bucke of seynt barnards works—6s.", which may have been his *Meditations*, printed in English by Wynkyn de Worde in 1496. He also bought that year "a book called herry boyke" in one volume, for 12s., which was no doubt the legal work of Bouhic, printed at Lyons in 1498; and a "book called hostiens, 11s"—hostiens was Hostiensis, Henricus de Segurio; and also "a book called the Englesshe cronacles 2s. 8d."—Wynkyn de Worde edited these in 1502 and 1515; and the "summa summarium" for 6s. 8d., which was a *speculum* of Canon Law. For a "lyttull bucke of seynt benetts rewle" he paid 6d.; this was supplementary, no doubt, for he had already bought for 2s. 8d. three books of the Holy Rule in English, which were probably copies of the translation made by Bishop Fox of Win-

chester and published in 1516 by Pynson. For what he called "a lyttull boke de predicacionibus" (St. Thomas?) he paid 10d. In 1526 he bought for 11s. 3d. "one bucke conteyning 3 councells, viz. consilia abbatis, consilia calderini, consilia lodwycy"—the abbot was Nicolo de Tudeschi, "abbas modernus" or "abbas Panormitanus", the Benedictine canonist; and the names of the other two may be recognized under their phonetic disguise: their individual works were evidently bound up together. Later on the Prior bought Capgrave's *Legenda Sanctorum in Anglia* for 1s. 4d., which has remained in the library at Worcester to this day, and some ascetical treatises by Richard Rolle and Ludulphus. Then there is a long list of the Fathers and some commentaries on Scripture, including the works of St. Bede, St. Hilary, St. Basil, St. Cyprian (edited by Erasmus), the *Quaestiones divi Thomae* (which cost him 11d.), and the *Opuscula divi thomae*, in one volume, sold at 5s. There is also a miscellaneous collection of books on law, which his position as president at the local sessions made it necessary for him to study, and a few other odd volumes—some Seneca, "a prynnt boke of fabians croniculls", Richard of St. Victor *De Trinitate*, Opera Willelmi Parisiensis, and "a luttull bucke de predicacionibus". In 1526 he bought "2 bokes of ye seven sacraments" for 18d., which were no doubt the *Assertio* of Henry VIII, printed by Pynson in 1521. Books of devotion, however, such as his missal and his breviary, were carefully written for him on vellum and illuminated in gold and azure. A new missal cost him over £6: "Payd to Richard Scryvenar for wryting of a new masboke £4 12s. with velume 22s. 5d. and florisshing of the hole boke—ye makynge of gylt letters 18s. Summa 122s. 5d." And again: "To sir thomas Edwards for limmyig, gildyng and drawyng of certain of my masse boke 6s. 8d." "To Arthur of Evesham for turnyng and limmyng of grete letters in my grayle 6s." "Item for gildyng and makynge of grete letters with byce 12s." This *byce* was a grey or green pigment used for illuminating the initial letters of mediaeval manuscripts. His *grayle* for use in choir and his breviary were also ornamented, and the latter was covered with cloth of gold at a charge of 2s. 2d.

A large amount of his annual expenditure went on food. A glance at this interesting feature of the rolls would lead one to suppose that Prior More was a typical example of the ecclesiastical bon-vivant so popular in a certain type of art and literature about the Middle Ages—who keeps his cellars well stocked and his tables laden with the choicest wines and delicacies. But we cannot infer from the evidence of his accounts that the Prior of Worcester was necessarily an epicure like Chaucer's Franklin, or still less a toper, since he catered not for himself mainly but for his large household, which was always supplemented by guests and passing travellers who seated themselves round his table every day. Distinguished visitors came too, and these had to be specially entertained. Calls from commercial travellers, itinerant friars, and passers-by of every kind were always possible at or around the Prior's dinner hour; so courtesy obliged him to keep his larders and cellars supplied with all sufficiency. His favourite wines seem to have been Malmsey and Osey (*vin d'Aussay*). He did not have to buy all his food, for his own parks supplied him with venison, peacocks and swans, and his own fishponds with roach, pike, tench, bream and pickerels. The upkeep of these ponds at one or two of his manors made a great demand upon his revenue, but it was an item in which he took an unceasing interest. He diverted the brook at Bale and made it flow into his pools at Grimley; they needed constant attention in cleaning, repairing the sluices, sewing and storing. In one week he stored one of the pools at Battenhall (which he invariably calls batnal) with tench, bream, roach and "pyckrell gadds", and emptied the other to the bottom, bringing in a good supply of fish for his table, including 200 eels. Sometimes, however, he was obliged to buy his fish, especially during Lent :

A load of grene fyshe at 12s. 6d. the load.

A berken of samon 12s.

2 barrells of herryng 11s., and 8s. 10d.

Item the frett of 2 hogshedds of salt fyshe and hake 12d.

Rabbits and pigeons were commonly served at the

Prior's board, outside Lent, as we can gather from memoranda scattered here and there among the weekly accounts :

From Hamvyaks warren this yere from quyttide to quyttide [Quinquagesima] in connys as by skore 222 couples.

From batnal 23 couples.

From Crowle pigeon house 160 pairs of pigeons.

He often exchanges presents from his parks with the local squires. Lord Dudley sends him venison several times, and the good Prior always tips the servant who brings it. The Abbot of Gloucester sent him a red deer, and he tipped the servant with 12*d.* At Candlemas one year he sent "2 calands of mustadell and osey to my lord of hereforde 2*s.* 5*d.*" And when distinguished visitors came to see him, he buys something extra special for them : "For mawnsey wyne spended upon ye abbot of winchecombe, with spyce to ye same 2*s.* 3*d.*" "Wyne to my lady salesbury sons 4*d.* 8*d.* 4*d.*" But although Mary Tudor stayed at his manor house the very year she was created Princess of Wales, and at other times for weeks together, there were no extra accounts entered in the Prior's ledgers except some fat tips to several of her servants on their departure. On the contrary it was he, the host, who profited by her visits, for among the rolls marked *Receptiones prioris wigornie* we find receipts for : "Offerings at the hye awter when I sang masse on seynt wlstans day 3*s.* 4*d.* in gold, by my lady princess." And again : "For 3 crowns of gold offered in tapurs, 2 peeces by my lady princess, and one peece by my lady salisbury, I singing masse on candlemas day." She also offered 4*s.* 4*d.* in gold at Easter at the high altar, and 3*s.* 4*d.* at the Assumption of Our Lady. But her father was not so generous, and though he never visited Worcester during Prior More's rule, yet he succeeded in drawing money from his purse long before the Dissolution : "Payd to the king for ye last payment of the 5th payments £9 18*s.*" —so there were at least four others. Wolsey succeeded oftener, for items of this kind come as a refrain throughout the latter part of the journal : "Payd this year to my lord cardinall for ye last payment of procuracions £3." It

was the Prior of Worcester who furnished Wolsey with horses on one historic occasion : "Md that I have bought to lend to my lorde cardinall towarde his journey to calys [Calais] to trete of peasse betwene ye frenche kyng and the emperor 6 horses ye price of them £12 os. 4d. Item payd for sadulls, brydulls and the harnes to ye same with ye lethern halters 46s. 10d. Item for conveyance [of them] up to london etc 20s."

There are so many items in the Prior's accounts of things bought by him for the furnishing of his manor houses—such as table silver, furniture, *objets d'art*, carpets and tapestries—that it is not difficult to form some idea of what an abbatial residence looked like at the beginning of the sixteenth century. They would be not very large, gabled country-houses, built of stone and timber, containing one spacious hall and a few other rooms, and sometimes a chapel. In the hall all the windows would sooner or later be glazed, sometimes simply, sometimes stained with heraldic escutcheons ; the corbels supporting the ceiling were carved, and encaustic tiles used for the floor. At one end there was a dais for the prelate's table and at another a gallery for the nomadic minstrels and jugglers. At Battenhall Prior More hung all the walls with red and green cloth, one hundred and twenty yards in length, and sixty-six yards "of foliage worke with dyvers beestes and fowl". The floor was strewn with hay or straw. An Arras carpet is specially mentioned. Fire-irons of different sorts also figure in the lists, including a "fyre pick", or as we should say, a poker, and a chafing-dish. At the hour of dinner the Prior's table would be covered with a damask cloth and laid with his silver sets. The salt-cellar was always the *pièce de résistance* at a mediaeval repast ; nuts (or cups formed from the shell of a coconut and mounted in silver) were also popular. Carving-knives, apostle-spoons, candlesticks, massive dishes and goblets are all mentioned in the rolls, particularly a drinking-cup "of byril grene colour", a gilt spoon with an image of Our Lady, a gilt ewer, a salt-cellar of parcel gilt with chased work, and a gilt goblet weighing 25 ozs. for which he paid £5. Meanwhile the servants would bring in long boards and spread them over

trestles down the length of the hall ; table-cloths of damask were used for the high table, but diaper everywhere else, and the benches for the lower tables were covered with green cloth. When the meal was ready the Prior sat at the table on the dais with his guests to the right and left of him ; and the whole household of stewards, valets, servants and all who wore his livery occupied the other tables with travellers or pilgrims who happened to be passing that way. During meals a chaplain would read something edifying or instructive, but on certain festive occasions the Prior hired a wandering minstrel or acrobat to entertain the household. At Quinquagesima he enters in his journal : "In rewards to mynstrelys upon quyttides sonday 2s. 10d." And at Easter : "Rewarded to Wyett and his son mynstrelys 14d." At other times he records : "To the kyngs jogyller 16d. "To 2 mynstrelys of my lord shrewsbury 20d." "To the kyngs juggler and his blind harper 6s. 8d." "To william ye lewter for playing and synging in the christmas wycke—nil hic." "To 2 childurn that tumbled before me and others 12d." "Rewarded to a harper of the dewke of bokyngham 12d." Every Christmas there are records of tips given to carol-singers : "Rewards for carolls 4d. 4d. 2d. 1d. 4d. 2d. 2d." Some of the most interesting items in the accounts are the receipts he made out for all the New Year presents that came his way—some from his monks, some from his tenants, and others from tradesmen in London who considered him a potentially profitable customer. The sacrist at Worcester invariably sends him a gold ring, but after some time it changed to "a galand of wyne and oranges" ; the cellarer sends him regularly a cheese ; the subprior a diaper towel ; and a few other monks Christmas capons. Other presents include a figure of Our Lord, a pair of kid gloves, a box of comfits, a "tooth pycke garnesshed with silver and gylt", two wild mallards, a piece of marmalade and two pounds of pomegranates. His tenants bring him capons, peacocks, apples, larks and cheese. These are typical entries :

"The supprior of moche malverne a peahen and 2 capons."

"Mocoocke of *the cardinals* batt a lamprey."

"Master Horwell a fesant ; the parson of seggebarow a peacocke ;

the vicar of tybarton a goose ; John crancks of london 2 boxes of biskitts ; the sexten a golde ring with a diamond ; Calaman the chamberar half a pound of pepur."

And the Prior tipped them all for bringing their gifts. Perhaps that is why he received so many ! He himself enters into the spirit of Christmas week by entertaining all his bailies every year to dinner and buying some special wine, nuts, and raisins for the occasion : "To Richard Childe for malmsey when the bailyes and citizens dined with me 13d". And he gives presents of money to the sergeants, the bearer of the tipstaff, and his own servants. Another year he entertained all the "scarlet gowns" of Worcester to dinner in his house. In fact, not only during the Christmas festivities is he generous with his money. Presents given by him to the poor, to hermits in Worcestershire, to his valets, to poor friars, and friends of his recur again and again all during the year :

"To 2 of our scholars going to oxford 2s." (These were young monks of Worcester, picked out among the others and sent to the University to study for their doctorate.)

"Rewards to 4 novices the third day after their profession 16d."

"Rewarded to the harmit of redhul crosse 5s."

"To brother ledbury the friar for ye singing of his furst masse 4s. 6d."

"To divers of my pore kinsfolke 40s."

"To relieving of the grey friars 12d."

"A pair of amber beads for my lady sannes of 5 setts 8d."

This was Margery Lady Sandys who wrote to Cromwell in 1535 defending William More against an accusation of misprision of treason and assuring him that the accused was above reproach, "for he is a true monk to God and the king".

A familiar picture to be seen in the countryside in those days would be the progress of an abbatial retinue, travelling slowly from town to town in great dignity, as the abbot went about his business. The Prior of Worcester made the journey to London on several occasions. He had, for instance, to attend Wolsey's convocations, notice of which he would receive some three or four months before. In the Michaelmas quarter of 1519

he records the news of an approaching chapter: "Rewarded to the abbot of wynchecombes servant bringing a commaundement for ye generall chapter and to apere at westminster before my lorde cardinall 3s. 4d." Early next year he starts to make his preparations:

"Rewarded to a purcevant 12d."

"Item for silke for a hatbande 2d."

"Item to Richard Corser for a peyer of boots 16d."

At the end of February he is en route:

"In rewards and gifts to my servants that ride with me to the generall chapter and their expenses, 40s."

He would be riding astride a white mare with picturesque harness:

"For a whyte horse amblyng £4 13s. 4d."

"For a cloth of puce color to cover my sadull 5s."

"Payd for a sadull and harnes with gylt buckulls 10s. 5d."

"For 2 pairs of spurs 8d."

The members of his retinue would be mounted on amblers or trotters—grey, bay or dapple; they are all mentioned. As they made their way along the roads a beggar or a poor hermit by the bridge would beg an alms and a coin would be thrown to him: "In alms when I ryd to london 10d. 4d. 8d."; and there would be a few delays: "Payd to Andrew my servant for reparacion of sadulls, brydulls, gurthes etc. 5s. 10d." In London the Prior seems to have stayed with the Bishop of Winchester, an old friend of his, for he spends £5 on tips to the servants of "my lord of Winchester" and various presents to the Bishop himself: "Item to my lord of winchester, a fresshe samon 12s. 8d.; a choll of fresshe sturgion 12s.; 2 pyckerells 7s.; a bake lamprey. Item for 2 horses for my lorde bysshopp £10." He also does some preliminary work for convocation: "To the regester for makynge and wryting of my acte of prefittion 19s."; and buys some new clothes for the occasion: "To Richard Gerves for a peese of calander for a cowle with ye makynge and silke at westminster, 17s." "Item for a hatt with a

silke corde 4*s.* 8*d.*" "For my ring with the amyties stone of gold 14*s.*" In fact, once established in the capital, his purse does not remain closed for any length of time. He does some useful shopping at the vestment-maker's, the silver-smith's, the milliner's, the book-seller's—where he buys the works of St. Augustine—and the grocer's, where he orders a supply of prunes, cinnamon, cloves, ginger, dates and two loaves of sugar. He is back again at Worcester for Holy Week and Easter, and starts a rigid economy to balance his books. This entry seems sadly significant of the Prior's incapable horsemanship : "To Nicholas for healing of rybbes on my syde broken 2*s.*"; and there is a touch of humour in the fact that his surgeon and his clock-maker are one and the same person. It is interesting to see that whereas all the monks of Worcester bore territorial names, not because they were nobles but because it was customary for them to drop their family names and take those of their towns or villages, the tradesmen are often called by the name of their trade. We have already met Richard Corser the shoemaker and Scrivener the scribe ; there are several other examples : Calaman the secretary, James Sawyer the carpenter, William Skinner the furrier, John Taylor who sews the Prior's clothes and Thomas Poticary who makes up his medicines

There are many records of the purchasing of clothes destined for the Prior's use. The appearance of these items in the rolls is always amusing, especially when thrown together among accounts for books, groceries and church plate : "Payd for 3 bonnets 6*s.*" "For dressing of my hatt with silke 5*s.* 4*d.* ; for 2 night caps 9*d.* ; for a pair of riding hoses 2*s.* 4*d.* ; for a pety coote and a peyer of socks 2*s.* 2*d.*" The old monastic customs of the Middle Ages allowed the monks to line their habits with inexpensive fur to keep them warm in winter. In these days of glazed windows and central heating fur is no longer necessary, but do not let us disapprove of the old methods of keeping out the cold : "To William Skinner for the furring of a pair of sleeves and ye ames [hood] 5*d.* ; for 2 pairs of furred boots with shoes to them 2*s.* 2*d.* ; for the furring of myn ames with shanckes 2*d.* ; for a pair of

slippers for mattens 10d." And he must have looked picturesque when he went out : "For 2 riding copes with rybbons 28s. 8d. ; for a satten hatt bought at london 4s."

The Prior of Worcester was bound by the custom of his monastery to pay out of his own income certain allowances to the monks of his house, in *exennia*, Mass stipends, or spicer money. Of these the regular allowances for blood-letting were the most expensive, though they do not seem to have been paid during Lent and Advent, or during the weeks of Christmas and Easter. There was a special Mass said at ten o'clock at Worcester, for which the Prior paid a stipend regularly every quarter ; and the monks took it in turn to say it : "For the singing of the ten of ye clocke masse to the supprior for the quarter 10s." After a few years the subprior finds it too much for him, for he passes it on to one of the others : "To dan Clement for the ten of ye clocke masse this quarter 10s." But very soon after it is changed again to Dan William Hanbury. Twice every year the Prior treated all his monks to a festive breakfast in the frater, and defrayed the cost out of his own income : "To the convent for a breakfast beef and mutton bred and ale 3s. 4d. ; Item payd to dan clements for breakfast 6s. 8d. ; for breakfast geese for the convent 2s. 4d. ; to the master of common supper for breakfast money 6s. 8d. ; for breakfast geese to the convent 2s. 4d. and garleck 1d." There was always, too, on Maundy Thursday a small refection of raisins, nuts and wine provided for the monks at the Prior's expense. In 1527 he records that "this wycke dan thomas astley departed to Abbergenny with a migracion", and not long after he pays the travelling expenses of one who goes to join the new foundation : "To george worcester at his departing to abbergenny 3s. 4d."

What kind of character do we find mirrored in these ledgers ? In the first place his friendship with Princess Mary seems to suggest More's conservative stand against the new religious views of some of his contemporaries, and this assumption is confirmed when we learn of the accusation of misprision brought against him with regard to the king's divorce and the character of Anne. Apart from

his religious convictions the rolls reflect a man who belongs to a certain literary coterie, with refined tastes, hospitable, generous to prodigality, a kind master and landlord, and "a good monk, true to God and the king". In his purchase of vestments and Church plate he is, perhaps, too decorative and ostentatious in his taste, but this was only exaggerating the traditional Benedictine principle of beautifying the Mass and Liturgy of the Church with as splendid a setting as could be afforded. For the rest, he seems to have been a good-natured man, thriftless with his money, kind to the poor, unbusiness-like, jovial, appreciative of good art and literature, friendly, chaste in an age in which there were some notorious examples of the contrary in men of his own rank, a lover of books yet not distracted from his duties of law and government. If we were to look up the answer in history, these are the traits we would discover there.

DOM ALBAN LÉOTAUD, O.S.B.

PREHISTORY AND THE FALL OF MAN

THE harmonization of the doctrine of the Fall of Man, not with the unproved speculations of prehistorians, but with the ascertained conclusions of modern science, is probably at the present time the most difficult problem in the whole range of Catholic apologetics. The day when awkward facts can be patronizingly dismissed as "unproved assumptions" is reaching its appointed term, and an hour is come which calls for calmness and candour, but not for panic. Science, as we know, is never in conflict with Faith, but it often conflicts with bad theology and faulty exegesis. The crude literalness which has so often disfigured the exegetical methods of later generations of Catholic commentators has undoubtedly created many artificial "conflicts" between Religion and Science. For the habit has grown up, and has, as yet, been by no means discarded, of treating the Bible as though it had been written by the schoolmen, and the desire to exclude from it every appearance of error has often led to exegetical acrobatics which are hardly edifying. Yet when full allowance has been made for these vagaries a residual difficulty is left. The conception of Adam as a being endowed with every perfection of body and soul and possessed in addition with a high degree of infused knowledge seems but little consonant with the portrait, revealed to us by science, of those early ape-like precursors of ours whose crude handiwork, no less than their skeletal remains, suggests the tale of a long upward struggle from a state approaching the brute. It is idle for amateur prehistorians like the late Mr. G. K. Chesterton to appeal to the gifted late palaeolithic artists of the Magdalenian period as evidence of the high intellectual endowments of early man. Such argumentation can deceive only those who lack even a bowing acquaintance with Stone Age chronology. For compared with the early palaeolithic peoples these men of the "Reindeer Age" were relatively modern. In attempts to remove the apparent discrepancy thus created between Science

and Christian dogma, those Catholic apologists who have not ignored the question altogether have had recourse to three separate lines of defence. Sometimes they have attempted to treat palaeanthropic man, that is to say the human types earlier than the late palaeolithic, Cromagnon and Grimaldi races, as the degenerate descendant of a higher type rather than the ape-like precursor of modern man. At other times they have revived, though in a more orthodox form, the seventeenth-century belief in preadamites, so as to exclude from our ancestry all human types anterior to modern or neanthropic man ; while yet a third suggested solution is to reduce palaeanthropic man to a sub-human status. I shall endeavour to show that none of these solutions is wholly satisfactory and then to indicate a fourth solution which, so it appears to me, offers better prospects of establishing that much-to-be-desired harmony between Catholic dogma and the teachings of science.

Perhaps one of the most prolific sources of confusion to be met with in scientific nomenclature has been that caused by Linnaeus' use of the term *Homo sapiens* in his *Systema Naturae*. For to introduce a term descriptive of a psychic state into a scheme of classification based on bodily criteria was to take a step pregnant with the seeds of misunderstanding. Linnaeus gave to man only generic rank, and of the genus *Homo* he recognized but one species, *Homo sapiens*. He could not at the time, indeed, have done otherwise. But zoologists of a later age tended to take up a more conservative position by according to man a status higher than that of merely generic rank, though they hesitated as to whether it should be that of an order, a sub-order, or a family. If the mental characteristics of man be taken into account then the pre-Linnaean naturalists who left him altogether out of account in their schemes of zoological classification were right. For in this respect there is a wider gulf between a man and a gorilla than between a gorilla and a daisy. The one is as incapable of creating civilization as is the other. Linnaeus was no materialist, and it was not because he was moved by any Wellsian predilections that he included man in his classificatory system of the mammals.

Man, as even the schoolmen admitted, was an animal, and therefore any scheme of classification from which he is omitted is incomplete.

For the eighteenth-century naturalist the genus and species *Homo sapiens* was represented only by the existing races of mankind, and these received no higher rank than that of sub-species or varieties. When the nineteenth and twentieth centuries added to our knowledge many new types of fossil primates, representing extinct forms transitional between the anthropoid apes and modern man, there were wide divergences of opinion with regard to the places to be assigned to them in the system of mammalian classification. Some inclined to regard Neanderthal man merely as an extreme variant of modern man; others made him a species distinct from *Homo sapiens*, giving him the name of *Homo primigenius*. More lately some have included *Sinanthropus pekinensis* in the genus *Homo sapiens*; others give him separate generic rank. *Pithecanthropus* has sometimes been placed in the same species as *Sinanthropus*, by others each is placed in a separate genus. The incompleteness of the fossils has, of course, been mainly responsible for this uncertainty. But personal preferences in selecting the criteria used in determining the differentia of genera, species and even families have also played their part.

Now, whether we accept the theory of evolution or whether we reject it, these fossil hominids cannot be spirited back into the gloom from whence they have been conjured, and the Catholic theologian can no longer treat of the doctrine of the Fall without taking them into account. Were they "sons of Adam" or were they not? This is a question which forces itself relentlessly upon him, whether he will or no. Let us consider in turn the three proposed solutions which I have mentioned. If the simian characteristics of palaeanthropic man could all be explained as the result of a process of degeneration the difficulty confronting us would find its simplest solution. Are they, however, susceptible of such an explanation? Degeneracy on a limited scale has been at work among the races of neanthropic man. The pygmies of the Congo Forest are, it seems reasonable to suppose, not relics of a

primitive ancestral type, which has survived through seclusion, but rather a degenerate race dwarfed like the Shetland pony through close interbreeding in a restricted area. Even the tall negroes have characters which give hints rather of a tale of degeneration than of the retention of primitive ancestral traits. We cannot by rule of thumb grade human races, living or extinct, in the scale of antiquity merely on the score of their resemblances to apes. Such a method would generate both error and confusion. It would not help us to fix the relative antiquity of the white and black races since the former show a greater resemblance to the apes on account of the more luxuriant growth of hair on their bodies, while the latter are more ape-like than the former in respect of their tendency to prognathism.

Were we to apply this criterion to prehistoric man the results would be positively misleading; for we should be betrayed into assigning to the Neanderthal man with his beetling brow-ridges a higher antiquity than that possessed by the much older Piltdown man with his high forehead. We might even be betrayed into assigning to Neanderthal man on the score of his large brain a lesser antiquity than that accorded to some of the earliest representatives of modern man. If we take the whole assemblage of Neanderthal man's specializations, they undoubtedly convey the impression of carrying the human form a stage backward on its journey from apedom. Yet there are wide variations among the skulls in the Neanderthal group itself, which suggests that degeneracy is at least a partial explanation of their special characters since the most beast-like traits are often found in the most chronologically recent specimens.

Moreover, certain skulls from Palestine and Moravia bridge the gulf between Neanderthal and modern man and seem also to imply that both sprang from an ancestral type in which features characteristic of each were combined. If the supposition be true that man, in so far as he is an animal, comes from the same stock as that which gave rise to the anthropoid apes, then we may perhaps suppose that under the rigorous glacial conditions in which Neanderthal man passed the later period of his

existence a kind of atavistic reversion to ancestral characters was called out. If again the Neanderthal men, who probably lived 20,000 or 25,000 years ago, were the most ancient representatives of palaeanthropic man, then we might find that the degeneration hypothesis solved all difficulties. For modern man must be at least contemporary with Neanderthal man and is perhaps older.

But this explanation breaks down if we try to apply it to the far more ancient men of Pekin, Piltdown and Java; since these, being nearer to the earliest *Homo sapiens*, if one existed before their time, would, on the assumption that they were degenerates, have reverted to ape-like characters in a lesser degree than Neanderthal man has done. In point of fact, however, their simian traits are much more marked than his. An attempt has quite recently been made to prove that a true variety of modern man was in existence contemporaneously with *Sinanthropus* on the strength of a fragment of a mandible from Kanam in Kenya Colony, which in the region of the chin approximates to the modern type. For this fragment an early pleistocene or late pliocene age has been claimed. But even setting aside the element of uncertainty which surrounds its age we cannot reject the possibility that the skullcap, were it known, would reveal features excluding *Homo Kanamensis* altogether from the category of existing human types. From the evidence at our disposal it seems reasonable to conclude that in the history of the evolution of living and extinct types of man degeneration has played a part, but only a secondary one, and that the main line of development has been a gradual upward advance from a primitive ape-like form.

The attempt to assign a preadamite status to the earliest human fossils was largely due to a desire to avoid assigning to the human race an antiquity greatly in excess of that consistent with current interpretations of biblical chronology. The long-continued belief in a hiatus between the palaeolithic and neolithic cultures lent a certain plausibility to this view. Without doing extreme violence to the evidence it seemed as if the latter might be classified as adamite and the former as preadamite. But it has now become clear that the hiatus

was in our knowledge only ; for its objective existence has been abolished by the discovery of the transitional mesolithic cultures. More recently it has been suggested that though the upper palaeolithic races were descendants of Adam, Neanderthal man was preadamite. This theory is not, however, tenable, since it seems certain that modern man and Neanderthal man existed contemporaneously. In addition to this, although the latter was doubtless greatly inferior in intelligence to the former, a close mental kinship existed between them. We cannot seriously suppose that a preadamite race evolved a particular complex of magical beliefs and burial practices, that it then became extinct and that afterwards an adamite race, having no connexion with it, proceeded to evolve a precisely similar set of beliefs and practices ! Nor is it any easier to treat Piltdown man, Pekin man and Heidelberg man as preadamites. For the preadamite theory to have any real show of plausibility a complete break both in cultural technique and in physical type would have to be demonstrated. No traces of such a break can be found. The evolution of both physical type and material culture is continuous. The theological difficulties in the way of postulating preadamites, if not quite so formidable as the scientific ones, are none the less real. Had such creatures, if they really existed, a merely natural knowledge of God ? What did they know of the moral law ? How was their obedience to it rewarded and their disobedience punished ? What aids did they receive in resisting temptation ? Surely it is wiser for us, instead of losing ourselves in such mazes of theological speculation, to believe that these questions have no real existence and that the appearance of man, that is to say of an animal marked off from all other animals by his possession of reason, is an event which occurred once and once only in the history of our planet.

Among the small number of Catholics who have faced the theological problems raised by the science of human palaeontology, some have suggested that their solution might lie in degrading to sub-human status all precursors of neanthropic man. This suggestion is by no means as arbitrary or irrational as might appear at first sight. As

the well-known prehistorians the Abbés A. and J. Bouyssonie pointed out in an article in the *Revue Apologétique* of 15 October, 1925, if no animal bearing a closer resemblance to man than a dog had survived, and that in these circumstances the skeleton of a fossil chimpanzee had been unearthed, it would have been thought to have been that of an aberrant type of man. Is it possible, they asked, that a similar mistake may have been made in the case of Neanderthal man and that he was no true man at all, but a sub-human member of the order primates? The Abbés in the end admitted that the custom of ceremonial interment and the magical rites associated with it are fatal to such a belief. Pekin man, represented at this time by but two or three teeth, and the fragmentary remains of *Pithecanthropus*, *Eoanthropus* and Heidelberg man gave no conclusive evidence as to the definitely human or sub-human mentality of their owners.

The year 1929 stands out in the annals of human palaeontology as the beginning of a new epoch, since then for the first time an uncrushed skull of a pre-Neanderthal type of man came to light, in the shape of the now famous *Sinanthropus pekinensis*. By the end of 1936 *Sinanthropus* was represented by fragments of no less than twenty-four individuals, the remains including five skulls, twelve lower jaws and nearly one hundred teeth. Considerable range of variation exists, moreover, within the *Sinanthropus* group, the smallest member, apparently a female one, registering about the same stage of development as *Pithecanthropus*, the largest one being in cranial capacity not far below Neanderthal man. The cranial vault in *Sinanthropus* is, however, lower than it is in Neanderthal man. This does not justify us in concluding that Pekin man constitutes a genealogical link between the Java man and him of Neanderthal. There are difficulties in the way of such a belief. But it does suggest that Neanderthal man, if he was a degenerate, was retrogressing in the direction of a much earlier type. The view has been put forward that the creation of a separate genus for *Sinanthropus* is superfluous since the gap between Pekin man and *Pithecanthropus* is not wide enough to justify this step. Weidenreich even thinks that

in some respects *Pithecanthropus* is the more advanced type, since in him the great supra-orbital ridges continue into the brow, instead of being separated from it by a furrow as is the case with *Sinanthropus* and with the chimpanzee.

Though in the general conformation of his skull *Sinanthropus* recalls far more than any later races of mankind the features of the great apes, in actual size of brain he towers above them, even in the lowest specimen of the race, and falls well within the limits of the inferior races of modern man. How are we to explain these contradictory features? Did *Sinanthropus* possess the use of reason or did he not? On his discovery there was considerable margin for scepticism with regard to this point. No creature possessing the faculty of reason had ever been known with a skull of so ape-like a form. Nine years have now passed since Pekin man emerged from the realm of hypothesis into that of fact, on the discovery of the first Sinanthropic skull, and little by little evidence has accumulated to show that his mode of life must have been above the animal level. Like modern man he enjoyed a mixed diet, supplementing the produce of his hunting expeditions by the seeds of the hackberry, a small tree or shrub which grows in the forest and semi-arid regions of Asia and North America. Many thousands of fragments of the shells of hackberry seeds were found in the cave inhabited by *Sinanthropus* at Chou-kou-tien. To prove that they were not introduced by rodents, experiments were made which revealed that monkeys alone broke up the shells in the way in which those in the cave were broken. *Sinanthropus* was an artisan: not having flint at his disposal, he made crude implements of quartz. He also worked in bone, fashioned tools from the antlers of deer and even made drinking-cups out of their skulls. He knew also how to use fire. Do these accomplishments necessarily raise him above the sub-human level? The distinguished French prehistorians already mentioned, the Abbés A. and J. Bouyssonie, have discussed this question in an extremely valuable article on *Polygénisme* in the *Dictionnaire de la Théologie Catholique*. They utter a word of warning against our assigning to Pekin man

a rational nature simply on the strength of them. They suggest that his use of fire and his workmanship may possibly be accounted for by an "association of images", an "*opération purement empirique et animale, sans rien de nécessairement rationnel*". *Homo faber*, they suggest, is not necessarily *Homo sapiens*. Moreover, they continue, every day we see animals performing complicated actions without our attributing to them belief in the principle of causality. If, therefore, no other evidence existed bearing on the mental status of Pekin man, the Abbés consider that it should be classed as doubtful.

There is, however, one further piece of evidence, and this is, perhaps, crucial. The human bones found in the cave at Chou-kou-tien are all either skulls or parts of skulls. No other parts of the skeleton have been found.* The heads had apparently been severed from the trunk before being brought into the cave. In one case, at least, the skull bore the mark of having been severed from the trunk by a sharp cutting instrument. This is most readily explained by the practice of cannibalism, the flesh having been removed from the skulls before they were brought into the cave. Creatures who beheaded each other, either alive or dead, removed the flesh from the skull of the decapitated clansman for the purpose of eating it, and then carried the skull into a cave cannot have been sub-human. Yet such seem to have been the unpleasing habits of the earliest men known to us. If then *Sinanthropus* had crossed the threshold of humanity we must be prepared to consider the possibility that his contemporary *Pithecanthropus* had done the same. Attempts, it is true, are made from time to time to deprive the Java fossil of its place in the hominid family and reduce it to the status of a large gibbon. But *Pithecanthropus* always possesses an uncanny knack of remounting the pedestal from which he is dethroned. For we have to remember that no anthropoid ape either living or fossil is known which achieved the brain capacity of *Pithecanthropus*, and his close resemblance to *Sinanthropus*

* This was the case at the time the article in the *Dictionnaire de la Théologie Catholique* was published. But during excavations conducted in 1936-37 two fragments of femora came to light and soon afterwards a fragment of a humerus.

makes it almost impossible to regard the one as human and the other as not. As Professor Ernst Haeckel espoused the candidature of *Pithecanthropus* for the status of a human ancestor, so some Catholics seem almost to regard it as a point of honour to refute that claim (for instance, W. R. Thompson, F.R.S., "Pithecanthropus, the Evolutionary Hypotheses", in the *Tablet*, 3 April, 1937). It is refreshing, therefore, to note a piece of evidence in favour of the hominid or human status of *Pithecanthropus* furnished by a Catholic scientist. Dr. Cornelius J. Connolly, professor of physical anthropology in the Catholic University of America, has recently studied the brains of fifty species of primates ranging from the lemur to man. He has found that the sulcus subdividing the inferior frontal region "is exclusively and constantly human, never appearing in the anthropoids; but there is evidence of it in *Pithecanthropus* and Neanderthal man" (*Nature*, 5 December, 1936).* By the end of last year the human or proto-human status of *Pithecanthropus* was considered to have been completely re-established by the discovery of a second and more complete specimen in which the entire temporal bone is preserved (see articles by Sir A. Keith and Dr. von Koenigswald in the *Illustrated London News* for 11 December, 1937, and by Prof. Franz Weidenreich in *Nature*, 26 February, 1938).

In an article in the DUBLIN REVIEW of July 1934 I hinted at the possibility that in *Pithecanthropus* and *Sinanthropus* we might be looking at the human body in the last stages of its evolution before it was united to a rational soul. But now we must consider the possibility, nay, even the probability, that in these remote hominids we see mankind in its earliest infancy. Their relation to the existing races of mankind is a matter of dispute. The Abbé Breuil and the Abbés A. and J. Bouyssonie incline to the view that *Sinanthropus* and *Pithecanthropus* belong to an extinct human phylum to which Heidelberg man also belonged. The Abbés believe that this phylum culminated in Neanderthal man and then died out. Keith and Weidenreich incline to the view that *Sinanthropus* is

* The brains of these latter can of course only be studied by means of endocranial casts.

ancestral to the Mongolian race, and the former considers that we must take into account the possibility that *Pithecanthropus* is the ancestor of the Australian aborigines. The intermediate links may be supplied, he thinks, by the more advanced Solo and Wadjak men.

Competent authorities believe that the deposits at Chou-kou-tien from which the *Sinanthropus* remains were derived were laid down 500,000 years ago. It seems quite incredible, in view of the basic mental similarity existing between ourselves and the Chinese, that we should have to go back half a million years to find a common ancestor. If, therefore, *Sinanthropus* is ancestral to the existing Mongolian race it would seem that current estimates of his antiquity are grossly exaggerated. It is, however, possible that both *Sinanthropus* and the later Mongolian man developed similar characteristics through living in the same geographical environment. Neither the theory put forward by Keith nor that advanced by Breuil exhaust the possibilities of the situation as regards the relation of *Sinanthropus* to later races.

At the western end of the great Euro-asiatic land-mass there lived contemporaneously, most likely, with *Sinanthropus*, the more highly developed hominid known as the Piltdown man or *Eoanthropus*. Though estimates differ as to the size of his brain, the Piltdown man has taken a step in the direction of modern man, since he lacks the receding forehead and heavy brow-ridges characteristic alike of *Pithecanthropus*, *Sinanthropus* and Neanderthal man. It is far from improbable therefore that the existing races of mankind descend from an as yet undiscovered type of man closely related to Piltdown man. This man may also have been ancestral to the Neanderthal type. The parent stem from which there derives on the one hand *Eoanthropus* and on the other the *Sinanthropus-Pithecanthropus* stock has not yet been discovered. If it were we should have tracked the stream of humanity back to its source.

No certain link uniting the human and simian lines is yet known. A big gap still remains to be filled between the largest of the anthropoid apes and the smallest

hominid skulls. Yet the distance covered by this gap is much smaller than that between the big-brained races of today, on the one hand, and *Pithecanthropus* on the other. It is, however, only fair to add that in the opinion of eminent South African anatomists the gulf separating the human from the anthropoid stem has already been bridged by the discovery in that part of the world of a fossil primate, *Australopithecus*. The first specimen, known as the "Taungs ape" from the locality eighty miles from Kimberley in which it was discovered, was claimed by Professor Raymond Dart as a true "missing link" uniting the human and anthropoid stems. Keith on the other hand argued that its geological horizon is too late for it to fulfil such a role and believes it to have been a near kinsman of the great African apes rather than in the direct human line (*New Discoveries Relating to the Antiquity of Man*, p. 116). But the controversy is still unfinished, as the recent discovery at Sterkfontein in the Transvaal of a second specimen of *Australopithecus*, from which a nearly complete brain-cast has been taken, promises to shed further light on the problem (R. Broom, *Nature*, 16 October, 1937). Professor Broom believes that *Australopithecus* is in the direct line of ancestry to true man, linking him with *Dryopithecus*, a long-known fossil anthropoid which inhabited Europe, North Africa and India in miocene times. Broom makes *Dryopithecus* the common ancestral form, both of man and the larger apes. Keith, on the other hand, while regarding *Dryopithecus* as the ancestor of the gorilla and the chimpanzee, does not recognize any common ancestor of man and the great apes later than the oligocene *Propliopithecus*, a fossil primate known only from its jaw. Thus at the moment stands the problem of man's origin.

Slowly, yet with unquestionable sureness, light pours unremittingly upon it, though deep obscurity still enshrouds many of its recesses. But the pale rays visible in 1928 have today given way to stronger ones, and by 1948 the whole problem may stand illuminated in the full glare of noonday. It would be difficult to find a competent anthropologist who would dispute that we derive our origin from a type of man much more lowly

than the lowest types now existing. The discovery of *Sinanthropus* cannot possibly be explained away as were with a certain show of plausibility those of *Pithecanthropus* and *Eoanthropus*. By seeking to ignore the discovery of Pekin man Catholic theologists can but bring discredit on the sacred science whose healthy growth it is their duty to tend.

Sinanthropus raises the question of reconsidering not indeed the Catholic dogma of original sin but certain aspects of the scholastic conception of Adam. Christianity had at the first an unpalatable truth to teach as a preparation for her message of hope. The doctrine of the universality of sin was the prelude to that of the universality of the offer of salvation. The universality of sin called for an explanation and the one offered by the Church is that of an aboriginal calamity. In support of this belief she appeals to the account of Adam's sin in *Genisis* iii. The pre-exilic Israelites had not the same interest in this narrative as had the Christians and even the post-exilic Jews. Although monotheism existed in Israel before the exile, Yahweh's special relation to the Chosen People overshadowed in interest His relation to the Gentile world, and Israel's unfaithfulness to her God, rather than the universal dominion of sin over mankind, was the theme of religious writers. The Jews of the post-exilic age with their more universalistic outlook and quickening messianic hopes saw a deeper meaning in the narrative of Adam's sin and one fraught with portents for all mankind (*Ecclesiasticus* xxv, 24). This idea is to be met with not only in the canonical Scriptures but also in the extra-canonical *IV Esdras* (iii, 21, vii, 48). Prominence is given also by Rabbinical writers to the effects of the Fall on Adam himself. A haggadic belief asserted that before his sin Adam was possessed of such gigantic stature that he stretched from Heaven to Earth. When he fell his height diminished (Art. "Adam", *Jewish Encyclopaedia*). After the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 Judaism contracted its outlook and the effect of Adam's sin on mankind came to play a less prominent part in its theology. Christianity on the other hand developed the doctrine of the Fall in ex-

pounding the complementary doctrine of the Atonement (Rom. v, 19; I Cor. xv, 22). If we wish to impress an unpalatable truth on highly educated and critically minded persons we shall do well to begin by understating it. But if we wish to do the same to simple-minded and uncritical people we should even exaggerate it to ensure its acceptance. Though the Church in teaching the doctrine of man's fallen nature has refused to sanction the notion of its total corruption, theologians have tended, perhaps unconsciously, to exalt the intellectual perfections of Adam, so as to make more real the doctrine of man's Fall. The absence of any scientific knowledge of early man between the Middle Ages and the end of the nineteenth century made this especially easy, and the Bible without the aid of an exegesis illuminated by modern science tended to give the impression that the earliest men were at a high level of culture. Interpreted in the light of modern anthropology, however, the book of Genesis does not appear to support that view or even credit them with extraordinary intellectual endowments. It depicts man first living in a now vanished state of familiarity with God, yet without even the elements of material culture. It is after the Fall and not before it that the arts of life, agriculture, domestication of animals and metallurgy are acquired. There is no direct allusion to a hunting stage; but perhaps there is a hint of it and of the spread of mankind to more inclement latitudes in the "garments of skins" replacing ones of vegetable matter, which themselves succeed a state of original nudity. Myths of the discovery of fire, so common among other peoples, have no place in the Hebrew narrative, as though perhaps the writer felt that a knowledge of its use was coeval with humanity itself. The Adam depicted in the Book of Genesis is a being from the point of view of material culture not unlike the Pekin man, a creature able to make use of fire, but without agriculture, domestic animals or the use of metals. Scripture nowhere suggests that Adam in physical appearance resembled the most advanced races of modern man. If scholastic theology has perhaps tended to exaggerate man's original intellectual endowments, Christian art has fixed in our imagina-

tion a picture of Adam as a member of the white race; while for Englishmen it is probable, as Mr. Belloc has suggested, that *Paradise Lost* and the picture on the frontispiece of the family bible has done much to stereotype this conception.

In view therefore of the portrait of the first man which fixed itself so firmly in our childish imaginations it is of interest to remember that in the pre-Nicene Church there was to be found a view of Adam more easily reconcilable with modern anthropology. According to this view, met with in the writings of Irenaeus, Theophilus of Antioch and Clement of Alexandria, he was a being not so much possessed of perfection as apt to acquire perfection and knowledge if he had remained faithful to God. On this supposition the effects of the Fall on human nature might be compared not so much to an accident which lamed a man after he had attained to full growth as to one which befell him as a child, and though not preventing his later growth, interfered with its natural and harmonious development. Upon the ultimate entrance of Evil into the world palaeontology can shed no light. The biblical narrative of the Fall written down, of course, tens of thousands of years after *Sinanthropus* and *Pithecanthropus* had lived is clothed, in part, at least, in the rich symbolism dear to the imagination of the Ancient East. But modern science has not in the smallest way discredited the assertion of the writer, repeated later by St. Paul, that an evil force external to mankind infected it at its birth with a spiritual disease.

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON, Cong. Orat.

STOLYPIN

ON the night of 31 August, 1911, a murderer's bullet cut short the life of Peter Arcadievitch Stolypin, Russia's most prominent statesman of the century. The consequences of this fatal shot are incalculable and this not for Russia only. Maybe without it the World War could have been avoided,* and most certainly bolshevism as a world power would now be non-existent. "The fate of a nation was riding that night." For those of us who were privileged to work in close contact with Stolypin it was clear at the time that his ministerial career was drawing to its close. There was little doubt that in the nearest future he would have to tender his resignation for the third time and that it would be accepted. But the man himself, that tower of strength round which national Russia was beginning to crystallize, would still have been there, and when dark clouds gathered over the country, as in the case of Suvorov, of Kutuzov, the sheer weight of public opinion would demand to see him again at the helm.

In order to appreciate the full significance of Stolypin's reforms it is necessary to have some idea of the country he served so devotedly and for which he gave his life. It is difficult to visualize Russia as a country, it is rather a continent, whose limitless plains are traversed by great rivers, whose dense forests stretch uninterruptedly over hundreds of miles, whose natural wealth is inexhaustible and future potentialities tremendous. With one foot in Europe, so to say, and another in Asia, Russia's culture reflected these dual and sometimes conflicting influences. Russia was a closed book for Westerners, a *terra incognita*; and though at the present day she is somewhat of a Mecca for the progressive intelligentsia of the whole globe, she has remained the land of mystery and as little known and understood as in former times. Besides, it is impossible to think of Russia as of one whole, as

* The Russian military programme was voted in March 1914. Were Stolypin alive it would probably have been voted much earlier, possibly at the same time as that of Germany, and Germany would probably have exercised more caution.

something conglomerated and uniform. There existed an infinite variety due to climate, soil, economic conditions ; laws and modes of living also widely differed in the various areas of the old empire of pre-war days. Finland, with its own separate Parliament and currency, the Kingdom of Poland, with its Code Napoléon, the Shariat of the Caucasus, the uncodified custom laws of many Siberian tribes all differed one from the other as they did also from the laws governing Great, Little, White and New Russia, which in their turn varied among themselves. Little Russia is now usually referred to as "Ukraine", the literal meaning of which is "borderland" : this borderland was a State at the time when it constituted the nucleus of Russia ; long before the battle of Hastings Kiev was already the "mother of Russian towns".

There were also the Cossack provinces (Don, Kuban, Terek, etc.), where the Cossacks enjoyed exceptional privileges and economic plenty in return for life-long military service. A delicate problem for the empire was its large Jewish minority, segregated within the "pale" of the Western provinces, increasing and seething with discontent. It was among the younger generation of Jews that the Revolution recruited its most fervent and fanatical adherents, and the failure to solve this arduous problem has brought upon Russia untold miseries. Yet the greatest problem Russian statesmen had to face was that of the peasants. Ninety per cent of the population were peasants, living on the land, subject to a most intricate system of land ownership. Here too there was an infinite variety of types of landed property ; moreover, there was the land bought by peasants and paid for with their own savings or else with the aid of the State Peasants' Bank, and this land was freehold with all it had on the surface and underground. This obtained for the whole country.

Bolshevism has simplified matters : no one owns any land at all, and there is no law except the will of Stalin. But this state of things hardly conduces to an understanding of Russia as she is today, as she was before, as she may —nay, will—be tomorrow ! Contrary to the general belief abroad, Russia was a land of great freedom. All the

rural authorities, village elders, police, members of the rural tribunals, were elected by the peasants alone. No one had the right to participate in these elections who was not a member of the peasant class, but it must also be admitted that a "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" was growing in the country. This tree was called "politics" and was taboo. Only such could partake of its fruit as had attained to and received the necessary initiation. With this one exception you could do pretty well as you pleased. As liberty entails the respect of the neighbours' rights and neighbours were few and far between, one had very much elbow-room to oneself, without encroaching on others' rights. Still there was this forbidden tree which inevitably attracted many ! The moment someone realized the existence of this prohibited fruit the said person hankered after it, so that when the taboo was lifted—or, more correctly, partially lifted—in 1905 the political field in Russia assumed a very remarkable aspect, especially in the towns (this was not the case with the peasants, who cared only for land and craved to possess themselves of as much of it as possible and by any means).

One after the other political parties sprang into existence, or else emerged into the open out of hiding. The *Union of True Russians* on the extreme right, the *Pan-Russian National Union*, the *Union of October 17th* which mainly represented the urban bourgeoisie element, the *Constitutional Democrats* representing the so-called intellectual proletariat or intelligentsia with a goodly sprinkling of Jews ; the *Party of Peaceful Renovation* (so insignificant that people said it could arrive at a meeting in one cab) ; representatives of Poland, several small national groups, and lastly the whole gamut of socialists ending with the *Bolsheviks* (as far as I remember, in the last Duma these numbered seven). Without entering into any details concerning these various political parties, their programmes, plans and ideals, it is appropriate to say a few words about the Constitutional Democrats, also called *Party of the People's Freedom*, or commonly *Cadets*, on account of the prominent part they played up to the time of the Revolution. This party had no footing in rural Russia, neither among the peasants nor

the landed gentry ; their supporters were among the class of bureaucrats and the townsfolk, with the exception of Little Russia, where they were less popular, because of their close association with the Jews, so cordially disliked there.

In Russia, as everywhere, the educated class was called upon to play a prominent part, for without it, it is hard to imagine the unity and cohesion of a State. On the other hand, without it the so-called "separatism" is likewise unthinkable. The mass of the people, in particular those who are rooted in the soil, are always conservative and patriotic—that is, ready to defend their ancestral heritage to the uttermost limit. This heritage is dual—spiritual and material. Its spiritual side—religion, for instance—may under given conditions cause a mighty, far-spreading conflagration, whilst the material aspect as a rule only extends as far as the eye can see. A village sallying forth to the last man armed with pitch-forks and axes in defence of its own boundaries may remain quite indifferent to a similar danger threatening other villages only a few miles away.

In order to widen the conception of mutual support from the limited area of the village to the wider territory occupied by a certain ethnographical group—in other words to create a basis for a "separatist" tendency—it is necessary first to determine the given area—that is to say, to teach its inhabitants to realize in what and how they differ from their neighbours. In provinces adjoining the frontiers of a State this happens automatically, and therefore here the feeling of patriotism is always stronger than in the interior. These feelings of national or racial unity have to be awakened in the people, and finally the masses have to be moulded into a separate group. And this cannot be achieved without the active and conscious help of an educated class devoted to its work. This is where the Russian intelligentsia stepped in. They may be blamed for many things—of having been perpetual grumblers, always in the opposition, full of impracticable theories, and so forth. Nevertheless, the Russian "intellectual" possessed two remarkable features : he was Russian and always identical in every part of the Empire.

Intellectuals seemed to be modelled in series : from Minsk to Vladivostock, from Archangel to Kars you found them ever the same. It is a phenomenon difficult to explain. Everywhere this type of intellectual read the same papers, *Rietch*, *Russkoe Slovo*, or their local equivalents ; he was generally a *Cadet*, antagonistic to the Government's every measure, could himself evolve nothing beyond high-sounding, empty theories, held a number of Government—and almost all the *zemstvo's*—posts ; though he never understood the people, he everywhere pushed himself to the forefront and aspired to leadership. These people spoke much and invariably spoke Russian, considering the study of local dialects beneath their dignity, despising them at heart, though they never would have admitted it.

This same type of man spread over all the different parts of Russia in a thin but homogeneous and exceedingly adhesive layer, not only welding the different portions into one whole, but absorbing and dissolving all local intelligentsias the moment they began to take shape, and thus moulding them all to his own image. In this way there is, or rather was, nowhere any national intelligentsia in Russia except where one had existed previously, such as in Poland, Finland, and the Baltic provinces. Where such a national intelligentsia did exist and upheld ancient national customs and traditions, these minorities recovered their independence as soon as they were able to. As to Little Russia, where both German and Austrian influences were rampant, and important sums of money were spent upon the creation of a semblance of separatism, it is a subject which deserves a special study.

To return to Stolypin : he belonged by birth to the old Russian nobility and his administrative career began in the province of Kovno, where his parents were land-owners. At the beginning of the revolution of 1905-6 he was already Governor of the province of Saratov. Those Volga provinces were particularly imbued with the spirit of sedition, yet Stolypin succeeded in defeating it, thereby drawing the attention of the central authorities to himself. Here for the first time the two fundamental features of the man's character manifest themselves : his unbending iron will and his utter fearlessness. An example : a

revolutionary mob headed by its leaders was on its way to burn and sack an estate. Hearing of this, Stolypin never hesitated, but drove out in his carriage immediately and alone to meet it. Driving up, he alighted and walked towards the crowd. The howling mob rushed at him ; without turning a hair Stolypin proceeded until quite near, when he suddenly took off his overcoat and threw it at the chief ringleader with the peremptory order : "Hold this !" The man was so taken aback by the unexpectedness of the action that he obediently held the overcoat, whilst the mob, surprised, stood irresolute. Time was gained, and Stolypin was able to persuade the crowd to disperse. By this time his energy and resourcefulness were becoming known in Government circles.

The constitutional chart of Bulygin* failed dismally to appease the storm, and then shortly afterwards, without any warning or the slightest preparation, Count Witte's Manifesto of 17 October burst over the country like a bombshell, granting Russia a chamber of representatives. Naturally things went from bad to worse, since none of the local authorities had been informed, or had received any previous instructions how to act under these new conditions. They were wholly unprepared to face the situation.

A little while later an energetic man, P. N. Durnovo, was appointed Minister of the Interior. The suppression of the Moscow revolt and punitive expeditions into the Baltic provinces had the expected results, and things began to improve. The Prime Minister Goremykin obtained from the Emperor the nomination of Stolypin as Minister of the Interior. The first Duma of the Empire met in April 1906 ; from the very first day it was evident that the views and plans of Duma and Government were so radically opposed that no compromise could be reached. There were only two possible ways out of the situation : either to grant a responsible ministry or to dissolve the Duma. This stalemate lasted seventy-two days. Goremykin insisted on the dissolution ;

* In the summer of 1905 a kind of constitutional chart was elaborated by Bulygin, then Minister of the Interior. This chart granted popular representation, but merely consultative.

Petersburg was full of the wildest rumours, people declared that the list of the new Duma Cabinet had been on the Emperor's desk for three days, others adding that the happy candidates went to bed in evening-dress so as to be ready at every moment of day and night for the summons to the palace. Yet at the end Goremykin's point of view prevailed: the Duma was dissolved, the Prime Minister sent in his resignation, and Stolypin was appointed to succeed him.

Notwithstanding the Vyborg Appeal,* Russia accepted the dissolution placidly: with the exception of a rising in Kronstadt there was no serious trouble, whilst the peasants, the overwhelming majority of the population, remained indifferent. Still, after such an upheaval as that of 1905 things could not settle down of themselves, therefore the new Premier's first task was to suppress every form of anarchy. By a series of energetic measures Stolypin obtained this result and was able to turn his attention to constructive reforms of which the regulation and revision of the land status of the peasantry was paramount and pressing. In 1861, when Tzar Alexander II liberated the serfs (only 13 years later than in Germany, if I remember rightly), every peasant was given a plot of land expropriated from the landowner for a monetary consideration. This, by the way, was never done in any other European State. This land was mortgaged to the State, but the law stipulated that any peasant who had paid off the mortgage could claim the corresponding area in full ownership, and thus be emancipated from all his obligations towards the *Mir*—village community. The whole of the land, up to[†] that time, was owned in common by all the members of the community, jointly responsible for the payment of the mortgage, though each man worked his own particular plot. Every twelve years the land could be redistributed among the community. This, however, was not obligatory and actually nearly half of the peasants never redistributed their lands at all. We must point out that these restrictions applied only to

* After the dissolution of the First Duma its left-wing members gathered in the Finnish town of Vyborg, issuing an Appeal to the Russian people enjoining them to refuse to carry out their duties, including military service and the payment of taxes.

the mortgaged land given to the peasants with the one condition of their paying off the mortgage, but not to the land they bought independently, usually with the help of the State Peasants' Bank, which advanced up to ninety per cent of the money. This land they owned freehold without any restriction whatever. Unfortunately in 1884 a seemingly insignificant addition was made to that part of the law which gave every peasant the right to quit the *Mir* after he had cleared his mortgage. This addition stipulated that he could do so only subject to the consent of three-quarters of the members of the community. Under conditions prevailing then in Russia this addition was actually tantamount to the cancellation of the right. The exit from the community was now padlocked, and a type of landowning most conducive to the growth of communistic tendencies among the masses became permanent.

To transform the *Mir* into freehold farmers and thus reshape the whole outlook on life of the vast majority of the Russian people it became imperative to cut the Gordian knot, and this was done by Stolypin. The *Ukaze* of 9 November, 1906, gave every peasant the right to claim his share of the common land in freehold property. This *Ukaze* entered into operation at the moment of its promulgation, though it was given the status of a law, that is passed through the Duma, the Council of the Empire, and received the Emperor's sanction only in June 1910! This shows how strong was the opposition to this law, strange to say, both from right and from left. If I may say so, this law was, literally speaking, dragged through by the joint efforts of the Russian National Fraction and the Fraction of the Union of 17 October, supported by some of the small national groups. Even then, at the last reading, it was passed by a majority of less than twenty votes. This law which changed the moral and economic basis of Russian life is the foundation of Stolypin's entire reform, of his famous policy of "backing the stronger and healthier elements". The results exceeded the most optimistic previsions: soon the number of land-surveyors was wholly insufficient to cope with this gigantic task. It must be borne in mind

that ninety per cent of the arable land in Russia belonged to the peasants and likewise that only peasants could own land in Siberia, the law forbidding the gentry to acquire any there. It can easily be understood that this new law created a certain shortage of land among the peasants, the more so if it is taken into consideration that before the War the yearly increase of the population surpassed two million five hundred thousand "souls", as one said in Russia.

Measures had to be taken, and urgently. The vast area of fallow lands in Siberia and Central Asia was awaiting the plough. Stolypin, aided by the able and energetic Krivoshein, Minister of Agriculture, Glinka, head of the department of transmigration, and others, toiled unremittingly. New railways were built, a whole network of secondary lines sprang into being. The necessary surveying works were carried out as rapidly as circumstances permitted, vast stores of agricultural implements, building material and grain were established. In some years the transmigration attained the enormous figure of 700,000 people. The amount of work needed to transport these human masses over several thousand miles, to supply them with all necessary machinery and foodstuffs, at least at the outset, can well be imagined. Stolypin surmounted all these difficulties. Under the creative impulse of one man the great Empire was developing on a gigantic scale, exceeding even that of the United States: towns sprouted like mushrooms, new industries were created, old ones reorganized. In the Trans-Caspian territory vast tracts of the richest soil in the world, barren because of the lack of rainfall, were irrigated by a system of canals connected with the Amu-Daria, Syr-Daria, Tedjen-Daria-Mughas rivers. The yearly crop of cotton nearly doubled.

Meanwhile the political struggle went on: the Second Duma turned out to be still more refractory than the First. Well do I remember the opening scene: after a long speech by Stolypin one of the socialists, a Transcaucasian, speaking on behalf of the Marxists, made a fiery attack upon the Government. After a lapse of over thirty years I am uncertain as to his name, though I am

nearly sure that his Christian name was Noah. Noahs abound in Transcaucasia, perhaps because of the close proximity of Mount Ararat. In a magnificent spontaneous speech Stolypin retorted, ending by the well-known sentence : "The whole of the last speech in so far as it was addressed to the Government may be resumed in two words : 'Hands up !' to which the Government in the full consciousness of its right and responsibilities replies also in two words : '*Nie zapugaete !*'" (You will not intimidate us). After sitting about a hundred days the Second Duma went the way of the First, and the election of the Third heralded an era of intense productive work.

But what of the man himself ? His personality, his aims, his ideals ? Before tackling this subject I am compelled to make a slight digression. As President of the Pan-Russian National Union, as well as of its parliamentary fraction, I was inevitably brought into close contact with the great statesman, all the more so because our Union invariably supported him through good times and bad, in season and out of season. Thus I was privileged to collaborate with him and believe I can honestly say that I won his confidence and friendship. I had therefore ample opportunity of studying him under different circumstances. If the portrait I am about to sketch is defective it will be due to my own shortcomings, but not to the lack of material.

Very tall, well over six feet, I should say, broad-shouldered, with a dark beard and regular features, Stolypin was a very handsome man, but what arrested your attention at once were his eyes—strong, calm, serene. It has been my privilege to watch these eyes on many different occasions : in moments of danger or difficulty, or in the hour of triumph, and never once did I see their steadfast expression waver. Russia was his consuming passion, her greatness, her happiness ; he was a Russian to the very core, and had no particular admiration for Western civilization. For him Russia was personified by the Emperor, with a clear understanding that the Emperor himself existed for Russia, and in nowise the reverse. With that he was the most loyal of subjects.

His capacity for work was astounding : from early

morning till late at night he was in harness—sixteen, eighteen hours a day. Over and over again he would receive me at one or two o'clock in the morning. He did not speak often in the Duma, but when he was expected to speak the enormous white hall was crowded and the seats for the public crammed to their utmost capacity. Even the extreme left (social-revolutionaries and communists), carried away by the glamour and magic of his eloquence, listened silently to words they would never have tolerated from any other man. Once I asked him how and when he had discovered this great gift of his. He laughed: "Why, only in the Duma." For forty-eight years he had lived without even suspecting the existence of this gift.

As his work progressed and his popularity grew by leaps and bounds he became more dangerous to the revolutionary parties, who, to render them justice, were prepared to sacrifice their lives for their opinions. "*You* want great upheavals, while *we* want a great Russia," Stolypin once said in one of his speeches, and as time passed, and the possibility of such upheavals grew more remote and problematic, hatred towards this solitary figure standing between them and their object intensified among the revolutionaries. No less than fourteen attempts were made upon his life, many of which remained unknown to the general public. I remember vividly one night when I sat discussing some plan of action with him. Conversation drifted on to acts of terrorism, and quite casually Stolypin observed: "Do you know I am a prisoner in these rooms; I cannot go about the Palace" (at the time he was living at the Winter Palace), "for there is a man among the guards who intends mischief. It is known he is there, but up to the present no one has not been able to spot him." This was said as if he were imparting a piece of gossip of no particular importance. The man was caught some hours later.

Stolypin himself was so convinced of his impending violent death that he expressed the special wish to be buried wherever he was killed. In conclusion—a last picture outside: it was a dark winter night behind the curtained windows; inside, the brilliantly lit desk

stood out like a bright oasis in the dim study. At the desk sat the Prime Minister with myself facing him. He was speaking, as he alone could speak, of what had been done, but mostly—nay almost exclusively—of what remained to be done: of the apparent calm on the surface and of the invisible undercurrents still stirring and seething in the depths of the country. Then suddenly, "When I have gone," he said, "Russia will carry on for three or four years more by the impetus I have succeeded in imparting to her, but after that . . ." The world knows what happened "after that".

P. TASKEVICH-BALASCHEFF.

CHRISTIANITY IN SWEDEN

THE Swedes appeal to most of us. Their ancestors the Vikings and their followers held a predominant place amongst those peoples who, coming from the north, spread themselves throughout the whole world at the time when the old Roman civilization was in a state of disruption and was being battered upon from all sides. The Scandinavians in common with the Irish had never been colonized by the Romans. Most of us, so great was their extension, can look back upon some Swedish or Scandinavian strain amongst our ancestors. Generally tall and fair, the Swedes are physically very attractive. To us Catholics, and especially those of us who are of Nordic stock, it is always a matter of deep regret that the Catholics amongst them number no more than a bare five thousand, and of these many are of foreign origin. Sweden has been considered by some to be a centre of world-wide Protestantism, because it is the one nation where the overwhelming majority of the people belong—at least nominally—to that religion.

The conversion of Sweden was later than that of the other Northern European nations. The great St. Anskar and many others, some of Swedish origin and some from abroad, were the principal factors in bringing about the reception of Sweden into the Catholic Church. The existence of a fine and cultured form of Catholicism in Sweden is proved by the beautiful cathedrals and churches which were built before the time of the so-called Reformation. Also the Swedes when Catholics had many great men and women amongst them who were conspicuous for their devotion to the divinely founded centre of all Christian unity, the Holy Roman See. The romantic figures of St. Bridget, together with her daughter St. Catherine, both of whom were Swedes, stand out in the Middle Ages as examples of feminine sanctity alike charming and severe. The daughters of St. Bridget have been chased from their motherland, and it is only in very recent years and in the face of great difficulty and opposition from influential quarters that their convents have been reopened upon Swedish soil. They have a

mother house in Rome in which can be seen the rooms occupied by St. Bridget and her daughter.

The return to Sweden of the nuns of this Order of the Holy Saviour should have very far-reaching effects. The reason for this is the great importance of their holy founder in the cultural development of their country. This saint, known to every Swede as *Sancta Bregitta*, who was born in 1304, about a century after the conversion of her country to Catholicism, is considered by most present-day Swedes as genuinely Catholic and Swedish, and is a strong link between them and the Catholic faith. She is so much a national figure that extreme Protestants have attempted to picture her as a forerunner of the Reformation. Her *Revelationes* is considered to be the first religious and literary work in the Swedish language of any importance. Her memory is respected and she is much esteemed by all her fellow-countrymen. Her Order is therefore in quite a unique position and has exceptional opportunities for exercising a powerful influence in Sweden. The male branch of the Order no longer exists and it is to be hoped that in the none too distant future it may be revived. That this may take place is a subject for earnest prayer amongst all those who labour for the return of Sweden to Catholic unity.

The Reformation in Sweden cannot be exactly assigned to any particular date. Little by little and gradually the old ways gave place to the new. Whereas in Celtic countries and in Holland and Switzerland Calvinistic Protestantism became predominant, Lutheranism was the form generally adopted in the North and so in Sweden. They have retained bishops, but merely as a form of Church government, in common with Anglicans. They have also priests and deacons, but the latter can hardly be considered as ordained ecclesiastics, as they are entirely occupied by works of charity. There are, too, religious congregations for women who are engaged almost exclusively in visiting and nursing the sick poor. The Swedish Church, like the other Protestant Churches of the world, pays great attention to Bible-reading and to preaching. Their doctrinal formulas are those of the Lutherans, but these are not so strictly adhered to as

formerly. They are still, however, held in great respect, and especially the Lutheran theology concerning justification by faith.

The first Protestant king of Sweden was the great Gustavus Vasa, who began his reign in 1523. This was at the termination of a war with the Danes in which the Swedes had been victorious, but only at the end of a fierce struggle which had left them exhausted and impoverished. They had gained their independence, and the immediate cause which had induced them to follow the lead of many other of the Northern States and to pass from their traditional Catholicism to the Lutheran Confession was Pope Adrian VI's refusal to agree to the deposition of the pro-Danish noble Trolle as Archbishop of Upsala. The Pope's action in this matter has been much criticized. It must, however, be remembered that unlike his predecessors he was by no means a political Pope, but one who earnestly desired that reform of the papal court and of the whole Church, which was so badly needed at that time. This Flemish Pope, who was the last non-Italian to sit upon St. Peter's chair, was confronted by enormous and seemingly insurmountable difficulties. This was the age in which many Popes had lived worldly lives and cared more for art and secular learning than for the maintenance of a high standard of morals and spirituality amongst the clergy.

The refusal of the Pope to allow the Swedes to have another Archbishop of Upsala to replace Trolle resulted in the exile of the Papal Legate Joannes Magnusson. He was a typical ecclesiastic of the Renaissance and it appears that he was not sure that success awaited Gustavus Vasa. This King was regarded by the Swedes as their national hero and their liberator from Danish oppression. His word to them was law. In 1527, when he demanded money at the Diet of Vesteras and said that if the ecclesiastical landowners did not provide this he would abdicate, the result was that owing to his enormous popularity he was able to turn the Parliament, known as the Riksråd, into a king's council and to become an absolute monarch. He had decided that Lutheranism was to be the religion of his liberated country. With one exception all the

bishops agreed to the surrender of the Church property and conformed to the new order. Following the advice of Luther himself, there was no break with the past. Much of the old ritual was retained and there was no crude desecration of images and vestments. Gradually the new service books were introduced and the Mass was abolished. It was the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass that Luther wished to abolish, and consequently the new Swedish Mass was purged of all the offertory prayers and most of the Canon and of every phrase which taught this doctrine, just as was done in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. To have the services in the vernacular was by no means unwelcome to the people, who were for the most part completely uninstructed in Catholic doctrine. That these Catholics who had been born in the faith which had been unassailed for centuries should have acquiesced so readily in the abolition of the Mass and in changes of so radical a nature can only be explained by the fact that the laity, with few exceptions, were so ignorant of their religion that they cared little. The clergy, too, were without formation or much education, and the monasteries, in which few monks were to be found, had degenerated into land-owning institutions. Bishop Peter Magnusson, a brother of the exiled Papal Legate, consecrated the new bishops with the old Catholic ordinal. He had been consecrated himself in Rome. This is considered by "High Church" Lutherans in Sweden to have retained for them the Apostolic Succession.

As in England at the time of Mary Tudor, subsequent sovereigns wished to restore the Catholic religion, but without success. Johan III in 1570, when the Counter-Reformation was at work, wished to welcome the Jesuits to Sweden. He worked for a compromise; he wanted Rome to give way as to married clergy, and the chalice to be given to the laity in Holy Communion, and upon other points; but Gregory XIII would grant no concessions to the Lutherans at that time and the King failed to have a national Church that would embrace all his subjects.

The next King, Sigismund III, was a professing Catholic,

but things had gone too far by this time. Lutheranism had become the religion of the Swedes and they had become attached to it. This religion, which respected personal emotion and individual interpretation of the Scriptures, had become popular. The doctrine of justification by faith alone had fascinated the people, who were happy in the assurance of their eternal salvation. The Catholic King had to witness the definite establishment of Lutheranism, which took place at the historic Upsala mote in 1593. There it was decreed that the religion of the Augsburg Confession was to be that of Sweden. This had been drawn up by Melanchthon and Luther to present to Charles V, who, like Johan III of Sweden, desired to have some kind of compromise in religious matters. It was a very mild statement of Lutheran doctrine in which were omitted all denial of free will, of the Pope's supremacy, of the character of the priesthood, of the seven sacraments.

The distinctive point that at once becomes evident when studying the Swedish change of religion is the moderation of those who introduced Protestantism. Nothing was done to excite alarm. Monks lived their remaining years in their convents. There were no popular risings in favour of the old religion and no martyrs for the Catholic Faith, as in England. The change was brought about very gradually.

The ancient Catholic Church buildings of Sweden have not been robbed of their decoration ; indeed, most of the churches are of very pleasing appearance. The altar with its lights, the tabernacle surmounted with an exquisite crucifix, statues especially of the Blessed Virgin and St. John are frequently to be seen. They show great artistic taste in the design and decoration of their churches and there is nothing that offends the eye as a result of a lack of artistic training in those concerned and amongst the ministers.

In practice the Swedes have retained much from the old Catholic days. Although they are entirely permeated with the religious teaching generally common throughout the Protestant world there remains a great deal in their worship which must appeal to Catholics. The principal

Sunday service is still known as High Mass. The ministers wear a chasuble or a black gown—more usually a chasuble—and nowadays among the "High Church" party the use of liturgical colours is becoming common. They have retained many of the old introits, sequences, graduals, etc. The service commences by an introit followed by a general confession and absolution, then comes the Kyrie Eleison followed in its turn by the Gloria in Excelsis, Collect, Epistle and Gospel. After the reading of the Gospel they have the sermon, for which the minister changes into a black gown. The creed is repeated and this generally marks the close of the service. There are usually introduced a number of psalms and hymns, which are of impressive beauty and are very popular with the people. The use of plainsong is becoming more and more frequent. At one time it was customary to celebrate Holy Communion every Sunday, but nowadays this takes place at intervals. On such occasions those who intend to communicate remain in the church, and the service is continued in a form which shows some resemblance to a primitive liturgy, although as it is at present it can hardly be considered as other than a Protestant communion service. The Sursum Corda, Agnus Dei and Benedicamus Domino all find a place.

The practice of going to Confession has been replaced by the "Skriftermal". This is a devotional service comprising a general confession with an absolution, hymns and an address. It is a kind of preparation for Holy Communion to which intending communicants are accustomed to go. However, the practice of individual confession to a minister is becoming more common, but it must still be considered exceptional.

The Swedes, too, have a Prayer Book containing collects, epistles and gospel readings, psalms and hymns and also Martin Luther's Lesser Catechism. There are also in this book the occasional offices of Baptism, Confirmation, Marriage, Burial and a Litany. Confirmation is not administered by a bishop. It is regarded as a mere admission to, or permission to be present at, the second service of Holy Communion. Although Martin Luther professed a belief in the Real Presence, they do not seem

to trouble much about retaining or consuming the bread and wine that is left over after a Communion Service. There are no ablutions in the Swedish office.

One man stands out in the modern Swedish Church, respected by friend and foe alike: Soberblom, Archbishop of Upsala, who died in 1931. It was during his term of office that the famous meeting of representatives of the Protestant Churches took place, which was also attended by representatives of the Orthodox Church. It is known as the Conference of Stockholm and was held largely under Soderblom's influence with the object of bringing together and if possible effecting a union of the various Protestant communions. The Bishop of Strangnas, Dr. Gustav Aulen, and Dr. Nygren, the author of *Agape and Eros*, are outstanding figures in the Church today, as it also Gunner Rosendal, the incumbent of Osby. They have all written books advocating a return to a more primitive and apostolic form of Christianity. They are very averse to modernism and would like to see more emphasis laid upon the sacramental side of Christian life. They would accept some form of apostolic succession, and although they do not desire a ritualistic movement such as has become common during the last hundred years amongst Anglicans, they are anxious for a more careful rendering of the Church worship. This group holds one of the great figures of the Swedish Reformation, Laurentius Petri, in great esteem. Under the aegis of this movement the celebrations of Holy Communion are becoming more frequent, and the Catholic idea of priesthood more common. At the same time mention should be made of Professor Brilioth, who has written a beautiful book entitled *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*.

Although the Lutheran Church is the official Swedish Church and their King is regarded as Primus Episcopus, there exist in Sweden a large number of other forms of Protestantism, such as Methodists, Baptists, Salvation Army, etc., and these bodies are tending to increase rapidly. The membership of the National Church is said to be ninety per cent of the population, but in a large number of cases this membership is merely nominal.

The number of communicants is extremely small, indeed, a very large percentage go to the Lord's Supper only once in their lives. There is in Sweden, as in all the Protestant world, a great deal of liberty and difference of opinion upon doctrinal matters; in fact, it is difficult to understand the mentality which may be considered to be typically Swedish in religion, except that it is generally felt amongst them that Protestantism is something national to which they should cling for fear of damaging their national culture. This very erroneous and hardly logical point of view is largely the result of the fact that their national hero Gustavus Adolphus, who reigned in Sweden during the times of the wars of religion in Europe, was a Protestant, and it was during his reign and as the result of his successful campaigns that Sweden became one of the greatest powers. From this time onwards Lutheranism and nationality became one and the same thing for the Swedes, and it was not until 1857 that the persecuting laws against non-members of the Swedish State Church began to be abolished. There are still laws on the Statute Book which can hardly be considered just and which make it doubtful if full religious liberty is really upheld in Sweden.

That their national Church should be in communion with the Holy See and that they should return to the Catholic faith of their ancestors is a point of view that even in these modern times of unbiased historical research is very difficult for Swedes to grasp. Perhaps it is true that they do not share with Calvinistic Protestants that instinctive distrust of Catholicism which is even sometimes extended to individual Catholics. But in common with all Lutherans they have an intense dislike of the idea of their national Church being in any way subject to the papacy. For this reason they are blinded to the fact that many of the high moral ideals common amongst them would be developed under the definite moral teaching of a Catholic hierarchy, which would replace that uncertain and individualistic guidance which is always an element in Protestantism. Private interpretation of Scripture, which is a great feature of Lutheranism, has nowadays led many to modernism and many more

away from traditional Christianity. A return to Catholicism on the part of the Swedish national Church would surely bring about a return to definite Christianity of the masses of the people who unfortunately are today rapidly sinking into agnosticism and religious indifference.

The national Church of Sweden being Protestant would appear naturally to be in communion with the other Protestant Churches, and we also hear of a movement to arrange inter-communion between Anglicans and this Church; the Lambeth conference of 1920 decided that Swedish ministers may be invited to preach in Anglican churches and that one or more Anglican bishops might take part in the consecration of Swedish bishops. To these propositions the Swedish bishops replied that they regarded themselves as being in communion with all the Churches which accept the Confession of Augsburg and also that they attached no weight to the question of Apostolic Succession in such a matter. They are naturally in full communion with the German Evangelical Church and all other Lutheran Churches.

On the question of Holy Scripture the Swedish bishops in their answer to the Anglican inquiry appear to adhere strictly to Protestantism, as they say that they regard the Scriptures as the *norma normans* "both with regard to life and doctrine", and they continue that they consider the "building of our salvation on God's Grace alone received by faith". As to whether the form of the Swedish Ordinal would be considered adequate to confer the Sacrament of Orders according to Catholic doctrine, the Catholic Church has not yet spoken and historical investigation is still necessary as to whether, since the time of the so-called Reformation, the administration of this sacrament has been in accordance with Catholic tradition and Canon Law.

During the period of one hundred years from the late seventeenth until the late eighteenth century it seems that the old religion of Sweden had entirely ceased to exist; the only places where Mass was permitted to be said were the private chapels of the foreign diplomatic representatives, and in these chapels the only persons permitted to attend were those connected with the staffs of the various

extraterritorial establishments. King Gustavus III permitted foreigners residing in the country to practise their religion, and the decree which guaranteed this is dated 1781. After this Catholics were tolerated for the first time and they seem to have done their best to use to the greatest possible advantage this spiritual liberty, such as it was. Although still surrounded with much hostility and with many official difficulties to overcome, they managed to obtain from the Congregation of Propaganda in Rome a priest of French nationality, by the name of Oster, who came to Sweden and became permanently resident in that country, but it was not until half a century later that there was any question of having a proper church or of opening a school of any kind whatsoever. In 1837 was erected in Sweden for the first time since the Reformation a public place of Catholic worship; this was effected through the influence of two Catholic members of the Royal Family, Queen Desideria and the Crown Princess Josephine.

The Swedish laws exclude the existence of convents and of Catholic schools, and those who live under religious vows there are forced to resort to legal subterfuges for this purpose. Under these conditions it is hardly to be expected that a native priesthood could be formed; at the same time it must be admitted that a very large percentage of Swedish Catholics, even when they are Swedish subjects, are of foreign origin. They are usually the children of German, Polish and French immigrants who for some reason or other have settled in Sweden during the last hundred years or so. There is now a bishop in Sweden, Dr. Muller, and several priests, amongst whom, however, are to be found only two Swedes. The French Dominicans have opened a house and there is also a convent of Dominican nuns, as well as the convents of the Briggitine Order already mentioned. But as the country is very extensive and the Catholics are very scattered, normal Catholic life is rendered practically impossible. A great many more priests are needed to visit at intervals the small chapels that are rapidly arising all over the country, and above all schools are required, which are not at present permitted by the Swedish law.

The Swedes have a great admiration for the English people, and the progress of Catholicism in England has made a great impression in Sweden. It has largely tended to uproot many of the ingrained prejudices amongst the Swedish people. They are now conscious of the fact that it is possible to be a good Catholic and a good Swede at the same time, and they are beginning to realize that Catholicism is the most comprehensive and the most international of all the great world religions. It is becoming more and more evident to them that their own religious tradition would lose nothing and would gain much by a return to Catholic unity.

They can see how Frenchmen and Germans can both be excellent Catholics and at the same time preserve the national approach to religion which comes naturally to each. Both believe and accept the faith of the universal Church ; the Frenchman brings with him into that Church his clear, logical thinking in religious matters and his asceticism, while the German loses nothing of his poetic mysticism and virility. Every race and nation approaches religion in a slightly different manner, but in these modern days it becomes more and more obvious that unity of faith is a great advantage from which much is to be gained. To take another example, Italians and Irishmen both believe the same faith, but how different in appearance are the churches in which they worship and how different is the religious mentality of this Mediterranean people from that of a Celtic people living at the extremity of the Western world ! Those Swedes who still love and cherish Christianity are nowadays beginning to realize that their great objection to Catholicism based upon national grounds is without foundation. Their fear of losing their characteristics, individuality, national usages and traditions, which have become dear to them, is false ; by a return to the ancient faith of their land they would lose none of those national qualities which we all admire. The return of the Mass once again to Sweden would mean an enormously increased spiritual vitality for this great people.

EDWARD BOWRON.

THE FIGHTING BISHOP

AHUNDRED years ago there was a revolution in Canada ; its failure was largely due to a Catholic bishop—Alexander Macdonell, the first Bishop of Upper Canada. He has long been known as the fighting bishop, a misleading title in spite of his participation in military matters, for he took no part in slaughter, yet a singularly apt title for one whose life was an heroic and uncompromising fight for his Faith, his countrymen and his Sovereign : that many of his most difficult contests should have been waged against servants of the Crown that he himself so ardently served is poignant testimony to his zeal ; his victory and reward are the inclusion today of a great Dominion in the British Commonwealth of Nations. His inestimable services to the Empire must always be coupled with the astonishing loyalty and integrity shared with him by his Highland flock—and indeed it is no empty metaphor to call him a shepherd who guided the destinies of so many men and women enfolded in his care—for they preserved their allegiance, and, through it, the Dominion, in spite of treatment that might well have made rebels of them all.

Little is known of Alexander Macdonell's early life, but that he was a Catholic born in the Highlands of Scotland in 1762 is enough to show that from early boyhood his difficulties were real and severe. The acrimonious penal laws were still enforced against Catholics, and an aunt of Alexander's suffered for the Faith. Priests moved about the country secretly, dressed in secular clothes, notable among them the beloved Bishop MacDonald who blessed the Standard for the Rising when Prince Charles Edward landed in Scotland, and the fascinating Bishop "Geordie" Hay. Alexander lived part of his youth in Glenlivet, then went to the seminary at Scal an.

Scalan was hallowed for Highland Catholics. It was the emblem of persecution and martyrdom that had alternately raged and simmered since 1560. After John Knox and his co-religionists had drawn up the arid Confession of Faith and revised the cruel Book of Discipline,

the fervour of fanatics involved the Scots governing authorities in excesses of suppression more idiotic and not less ruthless than those Thomas Cromwell carried out in England : but the Highland Catholics remained obdurate, so they lost all civil and legal rights, and children were disinherited if at the age of fifteen they still adhered to the Faith of their ancestors. Famine, in some cases, completed the ruin that the work of suppression could not achieve in the inaccessible districts of the Highlands, and whole families died out. In those parts the clans were strong, and Nature fortified them against prolonged molestation, but their very immunity from attack isolated them from outside assistance, and they were left to live as best they might on the frugal produce of their unfertile countryside. But after Culloden the loyal Highlanders who survived the defeat were left the victims of fanatical Covenanters who cursed them for "treacherous Highland cattle and sons of Satan". Priests were arrested, assaulted, and left to die of wounds and starvation. Chapels, poor enough and raised with personal labour and considerable sacrifice, were destroyed ; the shielings of wretched suspect crofters were burned, and babies were slaughtered before their mothers' eyes. Catholics in the Highlands in 1745 were in the same case as Catholics in Rome in the first Christian era. Bishop Nicholson founded the seminary of Scalan to provide for the sons of gentlemen a school where they might profit from Catholic instruction, and for the Church a nursery for Highland missionaries.

After the Rising even that remote spot was smelled out, and although the Bishop and his little company escaped into hiding in the hills, the building was fired. Later it was rebuilt in secret. So far was it from the usual ways of men that the only approach to it was a bridle-path known to few even of the neighbouring shepherds. By the time Alexander Macdonell went to Scalan the inmates might count on some measure of security, for, since the persecution of 1751 when all priests in Glenlivet and Strathaven had been arrested, when the extremest penalties had again been enforced, when the Pope had made a vigorous protest through the foreign Ambassadors at the English Court, the religious ardours

of the Presbyterians had been checked ; none the less, the Faithful were in constant danger ; Bishop Macdonald's was the last public trial of a recusant, in 1756, but he was forced to change his name and to move about with the greatest circumspection for the remaining seventeen years of his life, and although his banishment was not insisted upon he was watched continually. In the Lowland cities no Catholic of any nationality was safe.

The new Scalán, a long, low house with deep eaves, was less than thirty years old when Alexander joined the community. There he was in company with some of his own people, for he was a member of the Clan Macdonell of Glengarry, and round that district were scattered some sixteen hundred Catholics, mostly Macdonells and Macdonalds, although the Beatons, M'Lachlans, Mc'Intyres, McLellans and Chisolms were considerable folk too. Life was hard at Scalán. Discipline was strict and the hours of study were long. No weakling could shoulder the burden of missionary work in the Highlands, and he to whom was entrusted the teaching of doctrine had to be well equipped with scholarship. When Alexander was fifteen he was sent to the Scots College in Paris, and afterwards to Valladolid where he was ordained. In 1787 he returned to Badenoch as a missionary priest. It is possible to visualize him as he must have looked then, for an excellent portrait of him, painted after he had been raised to the Episcopate, hangs in Bishop's House at Alexandria, Ontario—the see of his successor. His hands were strong and sensitive. His hair was auburn, soft and a little wayward. His full red mouth was dimpled ; so was his rounded chin ; his nose was straight, the nostrils were arched ; his ears were large, yet they lay back against his rounded head, and his forehead was broad and clear. But it was his eyes that must have arrested attention : they were blue like the gentian on his native moorland ; looking out frankly and unafraid, they must have held men in a bondage of affection and respect ; they look out at one from his portrait now, with a twinkle in them, as though, one cocked eyebrow crooked, he were laughing at men's folly and politely wondering at man's stupidity in

preferring ugliness to beauty, rather than censuring or judging him.

The destitution of Highland Catholics was then extreme; persecution and famine had forced many families to emigrate to America, "and even substantial farmers were begging their bread". The Government did all in their power to hinder emigration lest the Highlands should become depopulated, but they took no steps to relieve the distress of the homeless, workless men. In the South, developments in industry had brought prosperity to places like Glasgow and Dunbarton, but employers there were not willing to give work to Highlanders, for few of them spoke English and most of them were Catholics, and since the anti-Papist riots in Glasgow in 1779 intense bitterness against the Church swayed the city, and Mass, if celebrated at all, had to be said in secret.

Father Macdonnell was undeterred by the difficulties of which he was aware, or by the manufacturers' declaration that they could not hold themselves responsible for outbreaks of violence against Catholics if they employed them. He interviewed Glasgow manufacturers and persuaded them to give work to more than six hundred of his Highlanders, and he himself, literally at the risk of his life, went with them in 1792 as their priest and guide. No trouble resulted from the arrangement, and the Highlanders lived happily in Glasgow for two years: then, through the depression caused by the war between England and France, many firms failed, and most of the six hundred were once more thrown out of work.

There seemed no prospect of any sort of employment for those men, and no means of earning a living except by joining the Army; but all soldiers were requested at that time to take the Protestant oath, which the Highlanders could not do. Father Macdonell therefore convened a meeting of Catholics at Fort Augustus and proposed the formation of a Catholic corps; then he left for London, armed with warm testimonials from the Glasgow manufacturers and a loyal address to the King from the Highlanders. The Secretary of State for War welcomed the proposal and the first Glengarry Fencible

Regiment came into commission with Father Macdonell as chaplain—the first Catholic chaplain in the British forces since the Reformation.

For three years the regiment was on defence duty in Guernsey. In 1798 it was transferred to Ireland, where English soldiers were trying to crush a rebellion by brutal and ruthless methods. The Highlanders' exemplary behaviour did far more than the rigorous treatment of the English to quell the rebels, and Father Macdonell, who was always in the field with his men, prevented further excesses that the Yeomanry would otherwise have committed. Destitute and wounded Irishmen were given medical treatment, desecrated chapels were restored, and Mass was celebrated again. Father Macdonell was an ardent patriot, and he wholeheartedly condemned the Rebellion; furthermore, in spite of former hardships and injustice, his followers shared his unshakable loyalty to the British throne. After the Treaty of Amiens, in 1802, the regiment was disbanded, and once more the Highlanders were faced with destitution. It was then that Father Macdonell made his boldest decision, which was to overcome Government opposition and conduct his entire flock as emigrants to Upper Canada.

The Prime Minister, Addington, received him with courtesy and gratitude; he expressed admirable sentiments concerning the Highlanders, but regretted that he could not interfere with the rights of the Scots landlords who opposed emigration on the score of depopulating the Highlands, in spite of having evicted the Highlanders from their homes. He then illogically offered to assist them to settle in Trinidad, where there was a dearth of colonists. But Father Macdonnell refused to jeopardize the lives of his followers by taking them to so unhealthy a climate. He refused, too, subsequent offers of settlement in other parts of North America and insisted that if his Highlanders joined those who had already gone out to Upper Canada they would do invaluable service through the fervour of their loyalty in a part of the country to which already disaffection had spread from the United States; even, when the time came, he absolutely de-

clined to transport the emigrants by way of the United States, so jealous was he of their unimpaired devotion to the Crown.

The Scots landowners fought strenuously against Father Macdonell's plan : they first tried to bribe him to abandon it, then enlisted the support of the Prince of Wales, who generously offered to accommodate the men on the waste lands of Cornwall. Father Macdonell's determination was not shaken, but he concurred with Major Campbell's suggestion of a military emigration by which the unemployed could be settled in Upper Canada and would also provide a defence force for the protection of their new country. The plan was agreeable to the Prime Minister, who would have put it into execution, but that he was forced to resign ; his successor, Pitt, abandoned it.

On the resumption of hostilities abroad the land-owners were commissioned to raise forces for foreign service ; consequently they desired more earnestly than before to keep the Highlanders at home, so that necessity would make them enlist, and a Bill was introduced into Parliament to hamper emigration by means of enforcing absurd restrictions on sailings. Meanwhile, most of the disbanded regiment made their own way to Canada, and in 1804, with his Bishop's permission, Macdonell himself sailed for Quebec.

The difficulties of the English Administration in Canada in the eighteenth century were formidable, and as no one thought that the country was likely to be of any future importance to the Empire they were treated with little imagination, and the Catholic question was one of the most delicate to be answered. The boundaries of the Provinces were not well defined, but Upper Canada was to include all lands west of the inter-provincial boundary of the St. Lawrence. The settlers there were mainly English-speaking, and when Father Macdonell began his ministry there were some thousands of Loyalists settled on lands granted them by the Government, but American rebels were steadily pouring in to exploit the rich new territories. Only the novelist could describe the heroism of Father Macdonell's work in the new province. His

patience, his courage, his courtesy and his perseverance seemed inexhaustible. He travelled hundreds of miles from one settlement to another, through almost trackless regions, carried his luggage in turn with one servant, slept dangerously in the open, sailed precariously down swift rivers, shot rapids, and braved the dangers of Red Indians, swamps and jungle. He instructed his people, built churches, established schools; he negotiated with the Canadian and English Governments for grants of lands for his settlers, encouraged school-teachers to work among them, and, owing to the deplorable laxness of the secular authorities, impoverished himself and ran into debt in order to pay the teachers' salaries. Contemporary records form a bulky and magnificent testimony to his zeal for his Faith and his zeal for the throne.

In 1807 Father Macdonell was appointed Vicar-General for Upper Canada, so that his duties and responsibilities were increased; they were soon emphasized by the official encouragement of the emigration of non-loyalist Americans to the Province, for such emigrants arrived in sufficient numbers for the Americans to boast, when Canada was at war with the United States in 1812, that they could annex the Dominion without soldiers. That the Yankee boast proved false was due in no small measure to Father Macdonell. He was foremost in recruiting his Highlanders to defend the country, and formed the Second Glengarry Regiment, a corps of men whose loyalty was entirely above suspicion. His bravery, the encouragement he gave his men in the field, the hospitality he extended to troops, and his work in opening up a road between Upper and Lower Canada, earned him the warmest of tributes from civil and military authorities, and when the war ended the Prince Regent sent him his thanks and approved an increase in his salary to raise it from fifty to a hundred pounds a year.

Dr. Somers observes: "It was . . . a fortunate thing that Catholic loyalty did not depend upon governmental assistance." Indeed, it would be hard to parallel the

* For much of my material I am deeply indebted to Dr. Somers' *Life and Times of the Hon. and Rt. Rev. Alexander Macdonell, D.D., First Bishop of Upper Canada*. The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

niggardly, indeed, shabby, treatment accorded by the British Government to Father Macdonell and his Catholic settlers. Grants of land were promised and indefinitely delayed : grants of money for the establishment and maintenance of schools and churches were promised and not paid : but eventually, over-riding the resistance of those who earnestly endeavoured to place all education in the hands of the Established Church, Father Macdonell secured the help needed. Therein he showed in a marked degree those qualities of tenacity and courage and devotion that proclaim him a fighter, and those qualities of tact, patience, and courtesy that prove him a statesman. It is difficult in this century to realize the difficulties of administration of rather more than a hundred years ago in Canada, when the Bishop of Quebec ruled over a diocese that stretched from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The Napoleonic régime in part accounted for the postponement of any plan to alleviate the situation, and, in spite of the Quebec Act and the increase of Catholicism through emigration, there was strong opposition in Canada itself to any strengthening of the Catholic position in the country. Nevertheless, after much correspondence and discussion and the advocacy and rejection of varying plans for the division of the diocese and the appointments of bishops, Alexander Macdonell was consecrated first Bishop of Upper Canada, in Quebec, in 1819. A more fitting appointment could not have been made, but it is characteristic of the new Bishop that he should have accepted his new honour with extraordinary humility and that he should have consecrated himself anew to the welfare of his people. One of his first acts on being raised to the episcopate was to open a small seminary to supply a few much-needed priests for his diocese, and in 1823 he visited Europe, where he spent two years fighting for proper provision for his priests and for assistance for the emigration to Canada of Highlanders who were still suffering extremes of poverty in Scotland ; during that time also he pledged his life for the good conduct of Irish emigrants accused of mutiny in Canada, on condition that he were given the means to supply them with clergy and schoolmasters ; and he declared,

fifteen years later, that he could remember the pledge without regret, although the conditions under which the emigrants lived and which he fought strenuously to remedy were enough to appal the stoutest heart. At that time he had more than thirty-six thousand Catholics scattered throughout his diocese, and only ten priests and fourteen churches. To add to his labours and increase his disappointment, he was deprived of the help of Bishop Weld, who had been made his coadjutor but who was finally prevented from going to Canada by his elevation to the Cardinalate in 1830.

In 1831, at the instance of Sir John Colborne, Bishop Macdonell was made a member of the Legislative Council; he was thus enabled to promote the welfare of his people through local government; but ill-feeling between Church and State was not thereby allayed, and the Bishop's troubles were increased by the perfidy of a priest whom he had received in good faith, whom he had accepted as a hard worker and appointed a vicar-general, and to whom he gave the charge of the mission at York. The Very Reverend William O'Grady played the part of a scoundrel. He was an Irish priest who had been suspended by the Bishop of Cork. He had emigrated "with a number of his countrymen who were trepanned into the service of Don Pedro, Emperor of the Brazils", and when the deception was discovered O'Grady had to fly from the wrath of the Irish to Rio de Janeiro. Thence he made his way to Upper Canada, where, by means of false testimonials, he insinuated himself into the Bishop's service.

Soon after his appointment to York a scandal arose, and after two friendly warnings had been disregarded the Bishop removed O'Grady's office to Prescott and Brookville. O'Grady refused to accept the ruling, spread malicious reports about the Bishop, organized a gang of the lowest members of the population to assist him in holding illegal meetings, and threatened to burn the church from which he was removed. The Bishop suspended him, and once more O'Grady challenged his lordship's action; he appealed to the Governor-General himself, and persuaded hundreds of disaffected persons, many of whom were not Catholics, to sign a memorial

in his favour. Bishop Macdonell had to meet the basest of charges, such as the fraudulent conversion of monies granted him by the Government for the maintenance of priests, whereas in fact he had given in eight years eight and a half thousand pounds of his own money for priests and churches. O'Grady was then formally censured by loyal Catholic citizens for trying to "take the ecclesiastical supremacy from the Pope and transfer it to a Protestant", and it is interesting to note that the loyal memorialists quoted the example of the "illustrious martyrs Fisher and More" in their protest. All the clergy in the diocese remained loyal to their Bishop, and, after meeting to discuss the scandal they wrote to express their gratitude to him for the work he had done, to congratulate him on his prospective service, and to condemn in round terms the behaviour of O'Grady.

The dispute was carried from the Lieutenant-Governor to Rome, where Cardinal Weld championed the Bishop's cause; but O'Grady was indomitable in his persecution, and he finally joined the political party headed by the reformer William Lyon Mackenzie, who gained power in the general election of 1834, and attacked the Bishop from a new vantage-point. Mackenzie led the faction who were opposed to the oligarchic form of government that had become established in the country and that had been strengthened by the success of the American War. His democratic views were aggressively urged and he brought upon himself the odium of the Assembly. He strongly resented any State aid being given to religion, so that in him O'Grady found a strong ally in his battle with the Bishop, and one of Mackenzie's first acts on gaining political power was to set up a committee to investigate O'Grady's charges against Macdonell. False testimony, amply provided by the renegade priest and his confederates, was accepted by the House of Assembly, and a resolution was submitted to the Government in condemnation of the Bishop, who easily refuted all the charges made against him, and submitted in his turn evidence of treachery and sedition against his opponents.

The Lieutenant-Governor denied any responsibility towards the Assembly, who countered by refusing to vote

supplies, and an election was forced on the issue of representative government and separation from England. Mackenzie's reforms had always been so tactlessly presented, and his supporters had been so undesirable, that he had been accorded summary treatment by his opponents, as a result of which he was goaded into extremes that led him from agitation to revolt. The Bishop acknowledged some legitimate grievances and desired their redress, but during the election campaign he whole-heartedly condemned the reformers and called upon all loyal Catholic citizens to support the other side and trust the King's representative to carry out necessary reforms. The Orangemen joined him in his fight to preserve the country from secession, and the Reformers were defeated. The Lieutenant-Governor then governed with less regard than he had formerly shown for the Democrats, and Mackenzie's party broke out into rebellion in 1837.

Toronto was Mackenzie's first offensive. The attack was unsuccessful, chiefly because at the outset the rebel general fell off his horse and broke his neck. The Bishop warned the Government that numbers of Americans were waiting to cross the border to join Mackenzie's forces and that there were many rebels in Kingston. He wrote to Sir John Colborne to propose a scheme for defence that included the raising of another Glengarry Corps. He took an active part in preparing the defence of Kingston, which was Mackenzie's objective in the early part of 1838, and did more than the Government to save the city; so much may be said without dispute, even if credence is not given to the story that at one time he took charge of the garrison himself. When Mackenzie was arrested and imprisoned by the United States authorities for violating the neutrality laws the insurrection was virtually at an end, although a secret organization called the "Hunters" made spasmodic trouble for some years.

It may seem pretentious to contend that the Bishop was largely instrumental in keeping Canada within the Empire, but a study of his life and of the English Government's mishandling of affairs in the Northern Continent of America is enough to justify the claim. Although he took

no part in fighting on the battlefield, he fought, in pastorals and addresses, for the principle that man must render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's, and it is significant that the Lieutenant-Governor asked him to postpone a visit to England owing to a serious disorder engineered by the Hunters. There can be little doubt that it was the Catholic Scots immigrants whose loyalty defeated the ends of rebellious Yanks and disaffected Canadians over a period of crucial years, and there is no doubt whatever that Bishop Macdonell secured for the settlers much of their material success and all of their spiritual advantages. To the end of his days Alexander Macdonell battled for his people. He came to England in 1839 to pursue his plans on their behalf, plans that he discussed with happiness and confidence with friends in Scotland two days before his death in January 1840. He was ill for only two days : as a fighter he lived : he died in peace.

RONALD RICHINGS.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

Communism and Man. By F. J. Sheed. (Sheed & Ward. 5s. net.)

A Philosophy of Work. By Etienne Borne and François Henry. Translated by Francis Jackson. (Sheed & Ward. 6s. net.)

Christ and the Workers. By Stanley B. James. (Sands. 5s. net.)

If only because they deal with the most important subject in the world, human work—the means to living—these three books are important. But though united by their matter, they are remarkably different in spirit and thus, taken together, make a very useful compendium. Whatever else may be said about it, it is undeniable that unless some men work the human race will die. Work is the means to life in this world. Man does not live by bread alone; but nothing, neither bread nor cinemas, can be got without working; the amount of food and entertainment obtainable without human effort is negligible, and though St. Paul's saying "He that will not work, neither let him eat" is amenable to many interpretations, it applies quite literally to mankind as a whole. This being generally understood and admitted, the question is not: Why should men work? but: Why should men *live*? It is to this question that every religion supplies its answer and it is in support of one answer or another that, explicitly or implicitly, human politics are necessarily directed. Why do men live? But this question presupposes knowledge of its terms. What is "man"? What is "life", or at least "living"? It is because we have flouted the nature of man that we have degraded human life; and it is because of this degradation that war and civil disturbance are the note of our time. It is to these matters that the authors of these books address themselves. Work is the means to living. Man is an image of God—not a Royal Academy portrait or a photograph, but a creature sharing God's nature; he knows, wills, loves; he is capable of collaborating with God in creating. What is called the "creative imagination" is an essential part of man's make-up—"The artist is not a special kind of man, but every man is a special kind of artist." Thus not only himself is an image of God, but his life on earth is an image of his life in God, "hereafter", "in heaven", in eternal beatitude. If it be not so, it is his own fault. If individuals or classes of men can claim that they are unjustly prevented from thus being and doing, the fault is that of their masters or governors. To these matters also the authors of these books address themselves. "A man can be a very good Catholic in a factory," say some. But this is not true today. For a man can only be a good Catholic if he be a good *man*, and the factory, industrialism, deprives the worker of an essential con-

stituent of his manhood, of his likeness to God. It takes away from him his power to collaborate with God in creating. To be fully human, man's work must be first and last what the whole created universe itself is—a participation in God's love of Himself, therefore godly, therefore holy, therefore lovely and made in love. We know that this is not possible under capitalism. We know that it is not possible, in spite of the removal of exploitation (if it be removed), under Marxism. We believe it to be possible only when society is Christian.

Communism and Man is divided into two halves. The first half is, in spite of a somewhat lecturing and hectoring style, a very good and clear exposition of Communism and of Marx's mind and character. This part of the book is excellent and most valuable. Unfortunately, the second half, in which the author sets out to describe the nature of man and Christianity, is very loosely and inadequately argued. In particular, the last chapters offer an altogether too easy exculpation of the betrayal of Christianity by Christians—the point of view is too suburban, too much redolent of the church-furniture shop.

A Philosophy of Work is a translation from the French. This is an entirely different kind of book and, in our opinion, it is almost completely good. The only general fault to be found in it is that it is perhaps unnecessarily pietistic in style. It lacks humour. The writers are without a sense of the comedy of created being. Apart from this we have little but praise. There is, so far as we know, no other book in English which throws so much light on the *idea* of work. The authors trace the history of work in Europe from the time of the Greeks to the present day; they trace the history of the worker from his slavery among the ancient nations to his return to slavery under industrialism. The idea of work in ancient Greece as being purely instrumental, in mediaeval Europe as being mainly penitential, in nineteenth-century Europe and America as being simply profitable and, when financially successful, proof of divine favour, in the twentieth century as being the means to leisure and "culture"—these and many other ideas of work have been dominant at different times. We owe the authors special debt for their clear and even courageous exposition of the penitential idea which, by a mistaken interpretation of Holy Scripture, clogged the minds of mediaeval preachers and prepared the way for so much misdirection of thought since the "industrial revolution" and up to our own time. It is difficult to imagine any book more valuable and more salutary than this.

There are some minor faults. The authors, like nearly everyone else, are somewhat romantic about "art" and beauty; they have

drunk of the poison which makes us think that the artist is a special kind of man, and yet the opposite view is the only one which is really in line with their philosophy. They are also somewhat romantic about the value of the quantitative achievements of industrialism and, particularly, of the value of the much-advertised but not always evident release from physical drudgery which machine facture is supposed to bring about. In spite of these things this book is superlatively good. We are told that to labour is to pray. We are told that prayer is praise as well as supplication, that praise is indeed its real essence. It is the virtue of this book that it leads the reader to this identification. The worker is not merely an instrument in the employ of a master. Work is not merely penance. It is not merely a means to money and leisure or even to power. It is not merely educative or a means to "contemplation" and to the service of our fellows. But, though in the purely physical order (an order existing only in logic) work is simply the means to living, the work of *men* is primarily and principally the making of praise ; and, in consequence, as the authors see clearly and as clearly state, the world of the Greeks and of their modern counterparts, the industrialists, is not a false one simply because of its cruelties and injustices, but chiefly by reason of its inherent snobbishness. This is a workers' world in its very nature. In our day we have succeeded in again reducing the workers to a sub-human condition, but our circumstances are not those of the pre-Christian world. Man now knows himself as then he did not. The statement of this fact is the culminating point of MM. Borne and Henry's book. Here is no rehash of the Christian-evidence lecture, but a fine and original piece of work.

Christ and the Workers is, as the publishers state, "an interpretation of Catholic Action in terms of the Young Christian Workers' movement . . ." The Y.W.C. is the "spearhead of Catholic Action". The task of the Church is to provide for the Christianization of the worker. She is adapted to the task, for Christ was Himself a worker and His apostles were working-men. The first Christians were from the lowest class of people, scoffed at as a community of slaves. These facts, though not forgotten, have in modern society ceased to sound the dominant note of Christianity. "The greatest scandal of the nineteenth century", says Pius XI, "is that the Church has lost the workers." This was inevitable, for work in our industrialism has ceased to be sanctifying and the truths of religion and the frequenting of the sacraments have ceased to have any connection with the working life of men. In so far as Catholics, and Christians generally, have accepted the secularization of life which the modern world implies, the fault is theirs and they must supply the remedy. But the evangeliza-

tion of the workers must be the work of the workers themselves. Under the inspiration and guidance of their pastors working-men must evangelize their fellows and so make the necessary foundation for a new Christian society. So far, good. The difficulty begins when we consider the exact nature of industry today. The mere facts of mechanization and mass production are the least of the difficulties encountered. If groups of economically free workers freely choose to co-operate in a system of divided and collective labour and to use machines, however automatic, of their own invention and liking and under their own direction (and such conditions are only possible when the ownership is legally theirs), then, however detrimental such methods of working may be to the quality of the goods produced, if their motive in such collective labour be the good of themselves and their families and the Common Good, there is no reason why, when there is widespread scarcity of common necessities, they should not do so. But it must be of their own free will and there must be a real need on account of real scarcity. There can be no other excuse for merely quantitative methods of production. Such a scarcity may be said to exist in many countries today, and therefore there can be no question of any immediate abandonment of the industrial method. Nevertheless it should never be forgotten that the historic origin of industrialism was not anything so disinterested. Greed of gain, more money, larger profits were the mainsprings of the industrial revolution and they are still the mainsprings of our financially ruled world ; and many, if not most, of the supposed advances in the standard of life turn out on analysis to be nothing but second-rate luxuries imposed upon us by salesmanship.

It is on such questions as these that Mr. James is a less sure guide. His quite reasonable admiration of the machines themselves seems to have blinded him, as it does most people, indeed, to the fact that the produce of such mechanisms is essentially impersonal and subhuman and is therefore only tolerable, as we have said, in times of famine and scarcity. Tinned food, like half a loaf, is better than nothing ; but that is the most that can be said for it.

As an exposition of the ideals and methods of the Young Christian Workers in their efforts to recapture their fellows for the Church, Mr. James's book is good ; but the cause he and they have at heart can never triumph while the life and conditions of the workers are alone considered and the product of their labour is not thought of. Doubtless the conditions of factory life can be made amenable to Christian precepts, but industrialism can never be Christianized because it is not only a method of working but a method of production, not only a way of making but a way of

making *things*, and the things thus made are finally and fundamentally unlovely and therefore unsuitable for human beings. The final test of factory life is not the morality or immorality of industrial technique, but the holiness of its fruits.

ERIC GILL.

Anglicanism in Transition. By Humphrey J. T. Johnson.
(Longmans Green & Co. 6s. net.)

The Church of England and Reunion. By H. L. Goudge, D.D.
(S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d. net.)

It is of interest, perhaps of good omen, that these two books should have appeared in the same year, the one from Dr. Pusey's college at Oxford, and the other from the Oratory which Newman founded at Birmingham when he moved there from Oxford, having made a longer journey on the way. They are both learned, balanced and thoughtful, by men anxious to understand the point of view of those who may differ from them widely.

"Not believing in the Anglican position," says Father Johnson, "I am not an apologist for any school of Anglican thought. On the other hand, there is much in Anglicanism that is naturally attractive to me . . . I trust, therefore, that I am not merely a captious critic." Owing to his objective outlook he has managed to produce the most penetrating analysis of Anglican thought, from the Reformation to our own day, which has so far appeared. He seems to be less interested in what men did than in what they thought, and thus his two chapters on Modernism are probably the best; those, however, who are on the lookout for cheap scores against the Church of England will look in vain, though it is difficult to disagree with his dictum that "with the publication of the biographies of Davidson, Gore and Halifax, the struggle over the creeds has taken its place in history. The liberalism of Sanday, Rashdall and Thompson is already just a little out of date. The clerical advocates of divorce, suicide and birth-control, already with us, are but the precursors of the paganized clergyman of tomorrow, who when he comes will pronounce Rashdall's views on sexual ethics to be as intolerably antiquated as Liddon's views on inspiration."

Towards Anglo-Catholicism Father Johnson is sympathetic and just: he tells the story of Malines—and it is a grand story—with understanding. He might perhaps have paid more attention to Frank Weston, of Zanzibar. Weston was a man of very strong character and great holiness of life, and it is a fact that the remarkable advances made by the Anglo-Catholic movement during the years after the war were largely due to his leadership and impetuous temperament. If one might criticize further, one almost regrets

his making the genial Mr. J. M. Thompson, whom so many Magdalen men regard with affection, responsible for the death of two bishops!

However, Father Johnson's book, besides giving an excellent picture of Anglican life, abounds in shrewd judgement: it should be read by all those who agree with the author that the "struggle of the rival parties in the Church of England is one of the most interesting chapters in the spiritual chronicles of mankind".

Dr. Goudge can be highly controversial; he will annoy a number of Catholics, and perhaps even more members of the Free Churches. He explains, however, that he is out to state quite frankly what he thinks, and he always states it charitably, backed by wide reading and an astonishing knowledge of the scriptures. He is not so much concerned with Christendom as he finds it today as with the attempt to find what it is the will of God that Christendom should be, and he comes to the conclusion that "the argument for continuity . . . is a very strong one. If, to take one example, the religion of the Old Testament was corporate to the heart's core, and the religion of the Fathers was just as corporate, it is almost inconceivable that the religion of our Lord and the Apostles was anything else." This more or less describes his thesis, which he supports energetically.

His chapter on the "Ministry in the Old Testament" is by far the most interesting, and is a most original piece of work: he shows what a one-sided impression of Old Testament religion has been produced by a close study of the prophetic combined with an almost complete disregard of the priestly books, thus misleading most people in regard to the background of our Lord's life. This chapter deserves the most careful study, for much of what he says is relevant for Catholics as well as Protestants.

One is now and then ready to quarrel with Dr. Goudge, but there are even more occasions when he interests and compels one's attention; on one occasion only does he disappoint, and that is over the Petrine claims. Quite frankly, he seems to the present reviewer to shirk this vital question, being content to dismiss it with a reference to the *New Commentary* and a fairly long footnote. He states that they are studied carefully by most Anglicans, but one is inclined to fear this is not the case; it is of interest that while Baron von Hügel's larger works have had a wide circulation in the Church of England, his little work *Some Notes on Petrine Claims* has been, from the publisher's point of view, a failure. Nevertheless, it is a most valuable little book, and for an understanding of the Catholic claims makes an admirable supplement to Butler's *History of the Vatican Council*.

Still, one must not look a gift horse in the mouth. Dr. Goudge's

excellent book comes as a breath of fresh air after the ill-mannered and ill-informed controversy which has disfigured a section of the High Anglican press during the last three years. One hopes it will be widely read by every school of thought : it is full of original ideas, and however much he provokes, one always enjoys the provocation. The reunion of Christians must be far off, but writers like Father Johnson and Dr. Goudge reassure one as to the direction in which the wind is blowing, as far as controversialists are concerned.

CLONMORE.

World Community. By William Paton. (Student Christian Movement Press. 5s. net.)

The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World. By H. Kraemer. (The Edinburgh House Press. 8s. 6d. net.)

"At the end of the present year there will meet, God willing, in Madras another great gathering of Christians. . . . It will embrace practically all the parts of the Church outside Rome. Its membership will comprise at least as many delegates from the 'younger Churches' of Asia, Africa and Latin America as from the Churches of the West. There will be present Japanese, Koreans and Chinese ; Indians and British ; Filipinos and Americans ; French and Germans ; Negroes and Afrikanders. . . . The International Missionary Council which will gather these four hundred and fifty people to Madras is one of the several instruments raised up in these latter years to give body and expression to the idea of the universal Church" (Paton, pp. 161-2).

Both these books are written in preparation for the Madras Conference. The missionary activity of the Church is not, cannot be, a side-line, analogous to a nation's colonizing activities : it is essential. Today that activity demands deep preparatory study of the attitude to be adopted by the Church in face of the peculiar temper and circumstances of our times. Technically, the world is a unity ; spiritually, it is disintegrated. The loss of absolutes has been followed in many quarters by the quest, and deification, of pseudo-absolutes ; Christendom, a social order based on and obedient to Christian principles, no longer exists except in tattered remnants ; and too often the association in the Eastern mind of Christianity with Western civilization has been disastrous for the spread of faith in Christ. There is needed, then, a reorientation ; we must first be very clear as to the nature of Christianity itself, in order to be clear about its relation to other religions and the main principles of policy we ought to adopt.

The first of these books, after a short but fine summary of essential aspects of the Church, passes to a description of the spread of Christianity through the world ; the difficulties which

face missionary activity (such as the various forms of nationalism), and the fundamental problem, Can men really be changed ? The point is clearly made that, while the Church cannot be indifferent to social evils, the approach to them must be the religious approach—social change will follow spiritual change ; and that two extremes are to be avoided, a self-reliant activism in the name of Christian social service, and a fatalist or acosmist evasion of practical effort in the name of Christian acceptance of the divine will. As Christians we are called to co-operate in the divine work of preparing the kingdom of Christ ; and we are to begin by putting our own house in order, by repentance, by killing our self-reliance which is itself a denial of our true Godward movement, and by trying to say, “Thy will be done.”

It is difficult to do justice to the value of Mr. Paton’s book, which in the compass of its 187 pages has so much that is of profound significance ; we have, too many of us, to plead guilty to a lack of understanding of and enthusiasm for the Church’s missionary activity : there is here the material to rouse, to instruct, to hearten, to provoke thought ; one can but hope it will be adequately utilized.

Professor Kraemer covers more fully a similar ground. A masterly examination of the essentials of non-Christian systems of life and thought leads on to the discussion of the missionary approach to them in general and in particular ; impossible here to do more than pay homage to the learning and depth and comprehensive sweep of the book, and to say that for study either of the whole question or of particular points it must prove an inspiration. There are points, especially in the discussion of the Christian faith and ethic, from which one is compelled to dissent, some of them misstatements of fact. Faith, in the Catholic view, is emphatically not assent to revealed propositions—the propositions are the *signa*, not the *res* : we do not believe in the proposition God became man, but in the Person of the God-man. This misapprehension seems, in consequence, to colour the author’s antithesis between biblical realism and the intellectualist conception of revelation. It leads him to parody the thought of St. Thomas : faith is not knowledge, but is set over against knowledge ; it cannot be expressed simply in terms of intellect ; grace and revelation are not a “perfected stage” of nature and reason, but belong to wholly different orders, the difference in this context of thomist from barthian theology lying in the fact that the former views grace as penetrating the (wholly distinct) order of nature, the latter denies the possibility of the passage of the infinite to the finite. Naturally, this difference of view with regard to fundamentals colours a good deal of the author’s treatment of Christ-

ianity which he undertakes in the earlier part of the volume ; but we have much to learn from the temper of mind behind this view, even while disagreeing with its formulations ; and the impetus to thought given here as elsewhere demands gratitude.

Both authors treat, of course, primarily of non-Catholic missionary work, and one of the effects of reading these books is to deepen one's sense of the tragedy of a disunited Christendom and of the urgency of the problem of reunion. The absence of representatives of Rome from conferences such as this of Madras does not imply lack of sympathy or admiration ; and we can but hope that those concerned will see deeper than the apparent arrogance of our non-participation. Mr. Paton records our belief that "devout Protestants may perhaps belong to the 'soul of the Church'" : we believe that all devout souls are members of Christ's Mystical Body, and if there is a "perhaps", it is not for us to insert it.

G. V.

Mary's Part in our Redemption. By Canon George D. Smith, Ph.D., D.D. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s.)

THERE has long been need for a good and comprehensive Mariology in English. Books on our Lady exist already in plenty, but most of them are translations from foreign tongues. In addition, many of them are full of piety and edification but can hardly be described as solid doctrinal treatises. The need for such a work is all the greater inasmuch as in recent years Marian theology has received a great development. Side by side with the marked progress in the doctrine of the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ there has been a parallel development in the doctrine of the dispensation of all graces through Mary. For many years now there has been much discussion amongst theologians concerning the title "Co-redemptrix" as applied to our Lady.

Many are the problems arising out of this Marian theology. Canon Smith has had the happy idea of linking it up with the ever-deepening doctrine of the Mystical Body. "Our Lady," he points out, "is a member, however noble a member, of the mystical Body of Christ ; she is not the Head." Hence "Our Lady's co-redemptive function is such as to be compatible with her condition as a member of the Mystical Body". Now our Lord shares with the redeemed His power of meriting and of making satisfaction, but He cannot give them the power to merit or atone as He merits and atones. . . . Any redemptive activity which the members of His body are able to exert is in a different plane, and serves only—under the constant influence of the Head—to apply to themselves and to others the fruits of the Head's redemptive act. . . . Now what is true of all the members

is true of each of them, and therefore also of our Blessed Lady." Hence our Lady's co-redemptive activity is "essentially of the same order as that which belongs to the other members of the Mystical Body".

Canon Smith goes on to urge that this is in no way incompatible with the truth that our Lady was "uniquely associated with that sacred Life, Passion and Death which were the universal cause of Redemption. . . . Our Lady's co-redemptive activity is of the same order as ours. And yet it is unique", precisely because our Lady was conformed to Christ our Lord by grace in a measure which transcends that of all others.

Applying these principles, Canon Smith adds that our Lady can truly be said to be the "perfect co-redemptive of herself"—not in the sense that she paid the price of her own redemption, as maintained by some theologians, but "in the same way in which all the members of the mystical body must co-operate in the work of their own redemption, by offering His sacrifice with Him and thus becoming a partaker of its fruits". And similarly, "Mary is the co-redemptrix of the human race". Under Christ and in union with Christ, the members of the mystical body are able to expiate sin. Mary had no sins to expiate, but all her sufferings were offered to God in union with the sufferings of her Son for the sins of the human race. Again, as under Christ Mary has atoned for every sin, so also under Him she has merited every grace for mankind, but with equitable, not with condign, merit.

Such is, in brief, an outline of the central chapters in this important book. Other chapters deal with the Spiritual Motherhood of Mary and her Dispensation of All Graces. Here Canon Smith applies the same principles as before. Our Lady's heavenly intervention on behalf of men, though unique and universal in its bearing, does not differ essentially from that of the other saints. In other words, our Lady dispenses graces by interceding for them, with an intercession which the Canon fittingly terms "suppliant omnipotence".

Canon Smith's book should go far to fill that need of a solid book in English on the position of our Lady in Catholic theology. It has been unfairly said that we English people fall behind our Continental brethren in the faith in devotion to our Blessed Lady. Our traditional methods of expression of that devotion are our own. But what was lacking was a solid work giving the theological foundation of our devotion. Such a work we now have. Its sense of moderation is everywhere manifest. Canon Smith is no minimizer. But on the other hand he cannot go all the way with certain modern Continental theologians. *In medio virtus.*

E. C. MESSENGER,

Confirmation in the Modern World. By Matthias Laros. Translated by George Sayer. (Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d. net.)

If we omit the sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist, which, as they correspond in the supernatural order to the daily needs of our physical bodies, are clearly intended for frequent use, the five remaining sacraments will be seen to correspond to certain crises in our natural life, birth, adolescence, marriage (or priesthood) and death, and were instituted to sanctify those stages in our life and give the graces necessary for each occasion. It may be that since adolescence, unlike the other four which represent clearly marked epochs in life, is a matter of gradual and undefined progress, we have in this fact an explanation of the lack of interest in the sacrament of Confirmation. Whatever be the explanation, the author of this book is, we think, justified in calling it the "little-heeded Sacrament of Confirmation".

He has written his book, then, not as a theological thesis but to make us realize its supreme importance as the sacrament that consecrates us to the apostolate of the laity and is, therefore, *par excellence* the sacrament of Catholic Action. This has enabled him to discuss the Pope's ideal of Catholic Action as the response of the whole man, of the full-grown personality, to the call to the universal priesthood and of the apostolate: "It has no use for marionettes or for puppets, but for beings with free will, with minds of their own and initiative." It will be seen that here is a line of thought, quite orthodox and according to the mind of the Church, which yet will come as a shock to many Catholics who conceive of membership of the Church as a lazy and hazy acceptance of certain dogmas with no particular call to bestir themselves in spreading the truths of faith; *that*, in their economy, is the work of the bishops and priests, and to a less extent of the monks and nuns.

The author is thus led, or rather forced, to discuss the exceedingly difficult question of the relations between responsible freedom and obedience to authority, and in spite of the inevitable dangers and possible abuses he has no difficulty in proving that in the necessary tension between these two poles is generated the energy that brings life to our faith and zeal to our good works. The Church is for ever engaged in guarding her children on the middle way of truth, tempted as they are to stray first to one side and then to the other. At one time Liberalism and Free Thought beckoned invitingly and she had to stress the authoritarian character of her divine mission. Nowadays envious eyes are cast on the bribes held out by dictators in exchange for liberty. The time has come for the Church to stress the importance of the free human soul designed by its Creator to pay Him the homage of its "reasonable service".

S. J. G.

The Fascist: His State and His Mind. By E. B. Ashton. (Putnam. 8s. 6d. net.)

THE first six chapters of this book seek to show what is Fascism, what its political, economic and administrative structure, and what the "position of war in the fascist scheme—and the concept of honourable peace". After which the author asks himself: "Has Democracy Failed?"—"Can Democracy Survive?" These concluding chapters give the key to the book; Mr. Ashton's thesis (he is an American) can be summed up in his own words: "To recognize the validity of Fascism for others—and to realize and emphasize and strengthen the distinctions which make it unsuitable for us—is our only chance to offset the proselytizing effect of future fascist successes abroad" (p. 265).

The author is a democrat and not a fascist, but he defends the democratic system only in countries that he considers truly democratic. Where Fascism, indigenous or imported, has triumphed, he holds that there were not the makings of democracy.

What Mr. Ashton has not fully understood is that the modern democratic system (which is very different from the classical one, and again from that of the Middle Ages) is of recent date even in England, whose traditions, up till half a century ago, were aristocratic and parliamentary, never democratic. France has experienced the demagogery of the revolution, the two Napoleonic dictatorships, the Second Republic of '48, lasting only three years, the Commune, while her present constitution, which is democratic but not always liberal, dates only from 1875. The oldest of the democracies, historically, is that of the United States, but even here the predominance of the capitalistic classes lessens and warps the democratic spirit of American institutions.

In substance, modern democracy is in its birth-throes (it is not old or decrepit), and as such it is not the privilege of the Anglo-Saxons or Franco-Latins or Scandinavians. It has experienced and is experiencing the crises natural to a young and new form of political life. Where, historically, it has been most fortunate, this is not due to any psychological or racial determinism nor to any other fatal necessity. The complex trend of events depends as much on individual human will as on environment, economic, social or historical. A man can save a country (Washington) and a man can destroy one (William II of Germany). A man can give a liberal impulse that will be valid for half a century (Gladstone), or can create the unity of his country in freedom (Cavour). No wonder that on the other hand there may be the great and small Napoleons. The same people can produce a Cato, a Sulla, an Augustus, a Caligula.

Since the author has neither a coherent philosophy nor an

historical outlook he seeks to explain particular facts by psychological or economic generalizations, which as such are inexact and explain nothing. One of these general criteria is the "collective spirit", which, he says, was wanting in Italy from the time of the Renaissance, when there was an "exaggerated individualism". From that time forth "in Italy it was a complete indolence". Which is simply nonsense. To speak only of recent history, does the Risorgimento, the Unity of Italy, her economic, political and cultural reconstruction, the Lybian War and the Great War—that is, a whole century beginning with the risings of 1821 and ending with the march on Rome of 1922—count for nothing in Mr. Ashton's eyes? He is thus able to conclude that today at last Italy has rediscovered the *collective spirit* through Fascism! If it were true that Italy had lacked it for five centuries, it is clear that she could not have regained it in a mere fifteen years. And if, on the contrary, she possessed it, with other aims and other aspirations (those of freedom, joy, personal initiative, art and culture), she could not transform these in fifteen years into a militarization of the whole of life, into an all-invading totalitarianism, without the use of violent methods and the dominion of force in an unnatural and transient form.

Mr. Ashton does not confine his study to the case of Italy, but includes that of Germany. Indeed, his book is a continual comparison of the two cases (not the best method he could have chosen), noting where they are alike and where they differ. His conclusion that Fascism does very well in its own homes, but is not for importation into democratic countries, would not have been the same if he had studied the case of Russia as a Fascism of the Left and those of Italy and Germany as Bolshevism of the Right, and if he had quoted the points of contact and divergence of the three great countries to which the war of 1914-1918 had brought the gravest crisis, moral, political and economic. But then the book would have been another one.

L. S.

St. John of the Cross. By Bede Frost. (Hodder & Stoughton. 18s. net.)

THE author of this "introduction to the philosophy, theology and mysticism of St. John of the Cross" is an Anglican clergyman and, we understand, an oblate of the Nashdom community. He belongs to the extreme right wing of his communion, and has already won praise from Catholic reviewers for books on the Mass, prayer and the priesthood. Now he has produced the first considerable systematic attempt to explain St. John of the Cross to English readers. We think he has accomplished his difficult task

so well that the result makes no unworthy companion to the great translation of another Anglican, Professor Peers.

The book is marked throughout by sound judgement and close familiarity with its subject. Where the author succeeds best of all perhaps is in showing how much the Doctor of Mysticism has to offer to the ordinary Christian. He has made this aspect a main theme of his work, as such chapter-titles as "Christianity in the great Tradition", "The Imitation of Christ" and "The Christian Life according to St John" bear witness. To understand St. John of the Cross, he says, one must first understand Christianity in its fullness: and if the saint is unintelligible today it is largely because real Christianity—the Christianity of the gospels and of St. Paul—is so little known and followed. St. John himself took such knowledge for granted—hence omissions in his writings that have led many to call them one-sided and exaggerated. We would not subscribe to every word of this thesis, but there is plainly much to be said for it.

The more mystical doctrines are treated in later chapters, where they are well summarized point by point, and a running commentary added. On the debit side one notes a good deal of repetition—largely accountable for, no doubt, by the fact that St. John himself repeats so much. The writer tends to minimize the saint's obscurity, sometimes ignoring difficulties that need facing, e.g. the puzzling illustration of "purgation of the memory" (*vide* "Ascent", Bk. III, ch. II, xi) is unmentioned. Occasionally he is narrow, as where the idea of any real conflict of St. John's teaching with St. Teresa's is "unthinkable" (p. 304). But such defects take nothing from our gratitude for an enlightened tribute offered in an unbelieving generation to contemplative ways and ideals.

DOM MICHAEL HANBURY.

The Origin of Russian Communism. By Nicolas Berdyaev. (Bles : The Centenary Press. 8s. 6d. net.)

THIS brilliant work should become a text-book for students of Russian Communism. The writer considers that the whole trend of Russia's history paved the way for the advent of Marxist totalitarianism; it is not so much the philosophy of Marxism which captured the Russian mind as its messianic aspect, whereby the proletariat became identified with the Russian people as a whole, and the revolution, though flaunting the banner of internationalism, eventually became national in its results. Mr. Berdyaev traces the sources of Russian Bolshevism not only to the intellectuals of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, *westernizers* and *slavophils* alike, to the *narodniky*, to Bakunin's anarchism, but

also to earlier thinkers, statesmen, and the originators of the totalitarian conception of the "Third Rome", to Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great.

Professor Berdyaev gives a searching analysis of Marxism, showing how Lenin readapted it to suit the Russian mentality; pure Marxism is, according to him, to be found in the *menshevik* socialist group, excommunicated by Stalinite communists. The character-sketch of Lenin is a profound psychological study of an outstanding personality: visionary and revolutionary of the extremist type, but also statesmen, imperialist, anti-democrat and absolutist; a man cast in the same mould as the famous Procurator Pobyedonostzev, whose depotic rule over the Russian Church contributed to her undoing. Both these men had a profound knowledge of human nature allied to a sweeping contempt for mankind in general. The parallel is as clever as it is unexpected.

This book is not merely the history of Communism in Russia; it is a study of Communism in theory and practice, of its relation to the individual, to society, and to religion. Berdyaev emphasizes his thesis that Communism is a religion, a profession of faith, an "inverted theocracy". As such it is necessarily hostile to Christianity. "The limitation and falsity of communist philosophy is due to the failure to understand the problem of personality, and this turns Communism into a dehumanizing power hostile to man." The new society, the new man, is "born of the growth of evil and darkness, the soul of the new man, is formed by negative emotions, by hatred, revenge and violence". Nevertheless, Berdyaev perceives the possibility of a "classless labouring society in which the denial of God and of freedom need not be included", a system he terms "pluralist socialism". The erstwhile Marxist seems to detect possibilities of a sudden transformation of Russian communism into a Christian communism, a conversion not impossible if indeed we are to believe that a totalitarian aspect of Marxism "fits in with the deep religious and social instincts of the [Russian] people", and if we are to accept the unique character of the Russian revolution.

Berdyaev dreads the possibility of the growth of a bourgeois spirit alien to the Russian people, and here we think he is mistaken: the advent of this bourgeois spirit is not a possibility, but the inevitable outcome of materialistic Communism. In this respect Dostoyevsky had a greater insight than Berdyaev; he knew that, like all alien ideologies, such a spirit was not in keeping with the religious instincts of the Russian people. That great inarticulate nation was never consulted, it suffered in patience the tyranny of the Muscovite tsars, endured the drastic Petrine reforms, and has now mutely surrendered itself to the dissecting

scalpel of a power whose very essence is in antithesis to its whole mentality.

Professor Berdyaev has succeeded admirably in his analysis of present-day Communism, but he is still too near to it to view it in its proper perspective and in all its implications.

G. BENNIGSEN.

The Mission of Austria. By Edward Quinn. (Sands ; The Paladin Press. 5s. net.)

A VERY readable and valuable book. Austria's mission, says the author, is to embody the forces of Catholicism, Germanism and Europeanism, and to provide a link between the West and the East. The Austrian "idea" and the way in which it has endured through the centuries are here admirably explained, with the possible exception of the country's early history, which, like so many other early histories, is rather difficult to follow, especially in the absence of a map.

It would seem that Father Quinn's whole thesis has been nullified at a single blow by Hitler's seizure of the country, but though the book is, on the whole, sad reading, it ends on a note of hope : "What has been attempted in Austria must be achieved in Europe" and "It may be that this very union of the German people accomplished by force will facilitate the revival of the Austrian idea in the Reich of the future".

The author traces, in a simple, straightforward fashion, the religious, economic, and political history of the country, special attention being given to the post-war period. There are explanations of what is meant by the corporate or (better) vocational State, and of Catholic Action in Austria, and outline sketches of Chancellors Seipel, Dollfuss, and Schuschnigg. In the last chapter the possibilities of a Habsburg restoration are discussed and an appendix deals with the University of Salzburg (which, report has it, has now been "brought into line" by being converted into a centre of national-socialist ideology).

In his epilogue the author gives his explanation of Hitler's instantaneous and overwhelming triumph of last March, but it is not easy to reconcile this fact with the author's previous statement that the "vast majority of the people, over ninety per cent., profess Catholicism".

E. F. P.

Poems. By Eileen Duggan. (Allen & Unwin. 5s.)

My first acquaintance with Eileen Duggan's work was on reading in some paper or another one or two brief extracts from this very book. Those extracts acted as a stimulant. I said to myself, "Here is something ; here, possibly, is the poet, the very poet for

whom we have all been waiting." A day or two later her book was placed in my hands with a request to give it a short notice in the DUBLIN REVIEW. My excitement rose. It has been rising ever since. I went to the editor and said, "Look here, these poems are important. Eileen Duggan is a discovery." And the editor kindly allowed me more space. But do I really need it? If I say that every lover and student of poetry will be the poorer for having missed this book, and if I go on to say that every man, woman or child (that vast horde) who is indifferent to, or even dislikes, poetry, should be urgently persuaded to read these poems that they may learn to love them, or forever hold their peace, shall I have said enough? I think not. To resist the temptation to quote is beyond my powers, and to quote is to whet appetites. Was not my own appetite for Miss Duggan's verse salted by these lines?

"Now are the bells unlimbered from their spires
 In every steeple-loft from pole to pole :
 The four winds wheel and blow into this gate,
 And every wind is wet with carillons.
 The two Americas at eagle-height,
 The pure abstracted Himalayan chimes,
 Great ghosts of clappers from the Russian fries,
 And sweet, wind-sextoned tremblers from Cathay ;
 The bells of Ireland, jesting all the way,
 The English bells, slowbosomed as a swan,
 The queenly, weary din of Notre Dame,
 And the low countries ringing back the sea.
 Then Spain, the Moor still moaning through the Saint,
 The frosty, fiery bells of Germany,
 And on before them, baying sweeping down,
 The heavy, joyful pack of thunder jowls
 That tongue hosannas from the leash of Rome—

Only the poet who knows his or her job intimately and who was born to hear clearly all the undertones and overtones of the slightest commonplace experience is capable of writing like that.

In his illuminating introduction Mr. Walter de la Mare calls our attention to Miss Duggan's use of such words as "wind-sextoned" and "brittling", begging us to mark their significance in their contexts, and describing them as "an unfailing finger-post" to the authenticity of the poetry. It is just that: the almost unerring choice of the unusual but right word, the careful (at her best) technique, allied to the natural instinct for poetry, impresses us on every page.

Miss Duggan's sponsor is right, too, when he suggests that, on occasion, her lines falter; "the fibre loosens". Much the same,

of course, might be said of any poet or versifier from Dante to Ella Wheeler Wilcox, but there are few who lose their grip so gracefully. Take, for example, the exquisite "After the Annunciation". Our Lady is on a country walk through wheatfields and vineyards. I quote the second and last quatrains (rhymes, be it noted, are justly in couplets) :

"A woman in blue with wheat to her knees,
Mid a silence of birds and a stillness of bees,
Singing, 'Golden, ah golden, with seedsprays unfurled,
Ripen within me, O wheat of the world !'

"A woman, gold-wet, with rainbow eyes,
And a border of living butterflies,
Singing, 'Purple, ah purple with tendrils close curled,
Ripen within me, O vine of the world !'"

Here there are two swiftly adjusted stumbles : the quantitative hesitancy of "seedsprays" and of "rainbow", technically the mere echo of failure, but in the whole effect almost admirable and certainly overwhelmed by the sheer loveliness of the whole. And again it is impossible to resist four flawless lines of another poem evoking the Mother of Jesus, superb in their simplicity and the astonishingly beautiful impression of the third line :

"Why do we never think of her
As standing at the gate,
A dim, blue patience in the dusk ?
'Jesus, come home : it's late.' "

But the whole book is one delightful procession of astonishments.

I am not naturally given to extravagant praise. On the contrary, my base inclination is ever to find fault in verse—even to the point of uncharitableness. For rescue, in this case, from all temptation to that sin, I thank Eileen Duggan. If only she will now attempt to use her multitudinous gifts towards some epic of her native New Zealand, in sustained imagery, there can be little doubt but that she will rank at least as the greatest woman poet of this age.

EGERTON CLARKE.

Chapter and Verse. By Margot Robert Adamson. (The Moray Press. 7s. 6d. net.)

Rossetti's poetry has been described as tense but not intense. Miss Adamson's novel is intense, which of course it could not be without a philosophy or a religion.

Its author is a recent convert to the Catholic Church, but the only "institutional" religion she is here concerned with is the

ministrations of a Scottish minister, which she represents with human sympathy (she writes his sermons for him!).

One merit of the book is the great literature it recalls, never by invitation but by consanguinity. It might stand between *The Highland Widow* and *Wuthering Heights*, and those titles are congenial to it. The book is likely to miss its due recognition only because it does not end tragically. When the story is well on its way one sees that it must end blessedly, like the *Divina Commedia*. Actually it ends happily.

It is a mystery story to this extent, that the major mystery is only partially solved at page 99, with an addendum at page 274, and a minor mystery not till page 250; but here (as indeed even in the great specifically "mystery stories", even in Wilkie Collins) the character (or, as here, the soul) is the substance, the crime only an accident, or at most an incident. Here the incident, accident or murder, has occurred on page 1. The solution of it is refused by the police—well, they would refuse it in the circumstances, anyway—but that would have been no solution for the author, and the poor hero would have secured his purgatory only at the expense of his mother—who, heroically, would not have grudged it to him—and at the expense of the spiritual development of the minister. But it is the soul of the minister as well as that of the hero with which Miss Adamson is greatly (but by no means exclusively) concerned. And the two policemen are among the great characters of the book. For this is an inclusive book. The background is there, and not so very far in the background. It is a real fishing village with real present-day economic problems and the perennial social, moral, and spiritual conditions. All the speaking characters are alive and those who are only named are not named only: each "stood for the whole to be imagined". And no one is more alive than the girl who is dead from page 1 onwards.

One need not claim that the character-painting is great: it is good.

The slightly difficult and intriguing technique of the book arises from Miss Adamson's perfect possession of her story. We are only to share that with her by treasuring every hint: nothing is said accidentally—it is to abide in your memory till its interpretation is vouchsafed.

The "chapters and verses" of the title are those so frequent with ministers and their congregations. Here they are pre-eminently these, in this sequence: Isaiah xxxviii, 11; Psalm xxvii, 13 (A.V.); John v, 14; Psalm cxvi, 9 (A.V.).

A self-questioning: Ought one to have seen the promise of this book in those other books of Miss Adamson that have not had their way with one as this book has had?

F. P.

Insurrection versus Resurrection. By Maisie Ward. (Sheed & Ward. 15s. net.)

We may confidently leave to others the fuller praise which Mrs. Sheed's second volume of her father's biography will certainly receive. No one could have been chosen more competent to write it ; no one could have written it more sympathetically, and yet with due discrimination, nor have made it more living. One wonders at her grasp of so many interests, education, liberalism, politics, literature, the mentality of other countries as well as of her own, to say nothing of the practical psychology which has enabled her to draw, clearly and to the satisfaction of her readers, so many portraits. The book will have a different interest to different readers ; to some the relation of Wilfrid Ward with Ireland and the National University will chiefly appeal, to others his role as a biographer, to others again his part in English politics, to yet others the extraordinary fascination, we may say affection, by which he drew around him all sorts of men, from different camps and different countries.

All this we can only mention, to show how wide was Wilfrid Ward's field of vision ; for us, naturally, the chief interest of the book must be the relation of Wilfrid Ward with Modernism, and with the DUBLIN REVIEW. To us who lived through those days, from 1900 to 1906, nearer to the battlefield than at the time we knew, we can truly say that the reading of the book has been a kind of agony. Illusion disillusioned is always painful ; when the memory of it is revived it still has its smart. The semi-mystical element that hung about Modernism when it first arose, thanks in great part to the spiritual side of its two chief English protagonists, was enough to deceive many at the time, as Mrs. Sheed points out, not excluding Wilfrid Ward himself. Even now Modernism is a word difficult to define, so are its boundaries ; much more was this the case when the chaff had not yet been sifted from the wheat, indeed, when the two were, as yet, scarcely distinguishable except by an expert eye. We mention this to show how delicate, anxious, and extremely painful a part Wilfrid Ward had to play during all those years ; perhaps especially when he accepted the task of editing the DUBLIN REVIEW ; for that made him, as it were, a referee in a heated controversy. We remember how the encyclical *Pascendi* cleared the air ; how all eyes were then turned on Wilfrid Ward, waiting to see what he would do with it. Up to then modernists had said he had been merely sitting on the fence ; now he would have to take one side or the other. Mrs. Sheed has made it clear, once and for all, that he was doing nothing of the kind. One less well-grounded in the teaching of the schools might well have hesitated ; as it was, his training in Rome and at Ushaw

stood him in good stead. Had von Hügel gone through anything like the same training he would never have made the mistakes he did.

This is, to us, the heart of Mrs. Sheed's admirable book. She has answered at full length the question : "What, then, did Wilfrid Ward mean ?" And in doing so she has written, not only her father's *apologia pro vita sua*, but also the history of Modernism in the Church as completely, let us hope, as it will ever need to be written.

Towards the end of the book she has felt it necessary to devote a special chapter to Baron von Hügel ; her analysis seems to us clear and just, both in its criticism and in its final judgement. If we may make one critical comment we would say that here and there in this book there are some general remarks, especially when dealing with "thought" and "thinkers", words which constantly appear, which, perhaps, twenty years hence she will be inclined to modify ; we think her mother, that centre of many affections, had she been alive would have modified them.

A. G.

The Catholic Eastern Churches. (12s. net.) *The Dissident Eastern Churches.* (15s. net.) By Donald Attwater. (Bruce, Milwaukee : Coldwell, London). *Histoire de l'Eglise.* Tome VI. L'époque carolingienne. Par Emile Amann. (Bloud et Gay. Francs 75.)

THE first two books are primarily works of reference (but at the same time eminently readable as books) to the current practices, organization and state of the Christian churches referred to in their titles. The subject is an exceedingly complicated one, but Mr. Attwater's method of arrangement has made it as clear as it can be made : under the wider heads of the general liturgical rites (Byzantine, Alexandrian, Antiochene, Armenian, Chaldean) he deals with each separately organized church or group in communion with Rome, and the dissident churches are similarly grouped under the names commonly given to their communions (Orthodox, Nestorian, Monophysite). There is a short historical account of each church, chapters in either book on such matters as monasticism and reunion, bibliographies, glossaries, and a large number of fascinating illustrations drawn from the ends of the earth. Single volumes on so large a subject could hardly be more complete, and they supply a need which a number of people in England and America have felt for a long time.

The first attempt to meet this need seriously in English was made by Dr. Adrian Fortescue ; but death prevented him from finishing his splendid pioneer work, and the numerous developments in events and research of the past twenty years have made

his books on the Orthodox and lesser Eastern churches in many respects most misleading until they are competently revised. Mr. Attwater is very up to date : he can hardly be blamed for not tackling the problem of why the so-called monophysites repudiated the Council of Chalcedon (though he is alive here and elsewhere to the atrocious influence of secular politics) ; but he gently drops the so-called second schism of Photius out of sight and, though he cannot resist the drama (or rather, theatricality) of 16 July, 1054, he makes it clear in other places that the Orthodox schism was not definitively consummated for another 400 years. The tone of both books is uniformly eirenical (and occasionally ironical), and Mr. Attwater has struck a heavy blow at the ignorant superstition not merely that the Latin church is the Catholic Church but that there is something essentially superior about the Latin rite and those who have the privilege of using it.

Professor Amann's 500 pages cover only 132 years, from 756 to 888 ; it is a superbly scholarly work and is the first volume of MM. Fliche and Martin's great undertaking to be entrusted to a single writer. In accordance with its title it is mainly concerned with the Church in the Frankish empire, but it neglects neither missionary expansion nor the Church in the East. In particular, the affair of Photius referred to above is treated at some length and in the light of the extremely important research and its conclusions which have been made during the past few years.

X.

Ludwig II of Bavaria. By Ferdinand Mayr-Ofen. Translated by Ella Goodman and Paul Sudley. (Cobden-Sanderson. 15s.)

It is difficult to make a hero of the last king of Bavaria, Ludwig II, who was drowned with von Gudden, director of the country's lunatic asylum, in the lake near Schloss Berg on Whit Sunday, 1886. The author of this "tragedy of an idealist"—for so the book is entitled—is at pains to insist all the way through that his subject was a great idealist, "whose tragic destiny lay in being too great for his time but not great enough to combat it". Flight from reality explains and excuses, according to Herr Mayr-Ofen, the disasters that overtook the unhappy king. The egotism of a man strongly homosexual in his affections and made king before he was nineteen was the undoing of Ludwig. He was for ever posturing. Absolute monarchy was his ideal ; the king of Bavaria must be another Louis XIV of France. And this in A.D. 1864, after the European upset of 1848, and in a small country where the people had already driven from the throne Ludwig's grandfather because he wasted the national resources on a notorious baggage, the courtesan Lola Montez.

There was no one to curb or in any way restrain the self will of the royal youth, who for twenty years saw himself a sovereign ruler. Nominally a Catholic, it would seem that Ludwig neither practised religion nor shared the faith of his subjects : when his Lutheran mother, whom Ludwig strongly disliked, became a Catholic, the conversion gave no satisfaction to her son. Solitude became a passion with this victim of self-pity. Ludwig and Ludwig alone could rightly appreciate the king. None of the stablemen, actors and artists whom he selected for his friends proved worthy of the patronage. As the megalomania became more acute so the vast expenditure and vast indebtedness for building increased. In the end it was this castle building that brought Ludwig to his death : castle building and the refusal to attend to affairs of state. Of course it amounted to madness—the younger brother Otto was already insane. But Ludwig was sane enough to understand that he was to be locked up as a madman and was drowned trying to escape.

The author rightly insists on the importance of the financial and personal protection the young king gave to Richard Wagner when the musician was still unrecognized ; insists rightly, too, on the influence of Wagner on Ludwig's dreams of a great and united Germany. The ideal of a united Germany which somehow left Bavaria an independent kingdom brought Ludwig to support Bismarck in the war against France. And Bismarck maintained that Ludwig was a shrewd and sensible man.

The story is all told in this readable book and the translators may be congratulated. But somebody might have mentioned to the author that it was Pius IX and not Leo XIII who was pope in 1864.

J. C.

The Charity School Movement : A Study of Eighteenth Century Puritanism in Action. By M. G. Jones. (Cambridge University Press. 21s. net.)

We do not recollect ever having seen a work similar in scope to this, and a study of the author's very extensive bibliography fails to disclose anything comparable with it. Our first duty, therefore, is to congratulate Miss Jones on an original contribution to our social history. The book is, indeed, a study of social history and does not concern itself with any theories of education or any administrative problems. Nevertheless it throws considerable light on both these aspects of English education and provides an explanation of the peculiar difficulties, mostly centring round the religious question, that still beset our educational system.

It may be said that the Jesuits began it ! In 1685 they were granted permission by James II to open a chapel in the Savoy and

they immediately attached thereto a charity school for the education of poor children. That was enough to alarm both the Anglicans and the Dissenters, and both parties threw themselves into the task of providing similar schools all over the country to combat the spread of a religion "absurd in itself and oppressive to the liberty of the souls of men". Hence the Pyramids! Hence all the quarrels, the squabbles, the bigotries that bedevil our educational system down to this present day. Hence also the curious fact that there is no bother made about the religious (or irreligious) complexion of fee-paying schools—only about the religion of the poor man's schools. The argument that public money demands public control is a red-herring. The rich man pays for his son's schooling direct to the bursar of his college and gets what he wants ; the poor man pays indirectly by means of rates and taxes and gets what is given to him.

The educational system of the Charity Schools, if it can be called a system, has had a bad press, but it was not as bad as it is painted by modern educationists. It was based on religion : not necessarily a bad foundation, as some of our moderns are beginning to recognize. It sought to build up character rather than impart useless knowledge : that ideal, too, has a modern ring about it, for under the more imposing title of "Vocational Training" educationists are rediscovering the truth that a child has hands as well as ears and eyes. It was a system that encouraged harsh discipline and condoned brutal treatment : have the critics, we wonder, never heard of Keate of Eton, of Butler of Shrewsbury, of Parr of Norwich ? Finally, the education given by the charity schools, say the moderns, was narrow and illiberal, the curriculum confined mainly to reading and repetition. Let Miss Jones answer this objection :

"But as the common text-book of the schools was the Bible, the liberal value of charity school education is consistently underrated. It would be difficult to find a text-book which clothed instruction in so perfect a literary form, or to find teaching more conducive to intelligent criticism of social conditions than the gospel of the poor. A sense of the beauty of words, an appreciation of poetry, and a burning fire of indignation for social evils are not uncommon possessions of Bible students."

S. J. G.

Mountains of the Moon. By Patrick M. Synge. (Lindsay Drummond. 15s. net.)

FOR many Africa is still so much the "Dark Continent" that any attempt to dissipate the darkness meets with approval, and Mr.

Synge's *Mountains of the Moon* may be acclaimed as a sterling contribution to the ever increasing supply of literature dealing with East Africa. The book really is a mine of information, capable of interesting not only lovers of nature but all who are concerned with the progress of the Africans committed to our care.

The greater portion of the book deals with the scenery and vegetation of the mountain zones of central Africa, and the author's descriptions, coupled with admirable illustrations, furnish us with a stereoscope through which we can gaze in speechless astonishment at the splendid savagery of unspoilt nature, admire the charming lakes nestling in the most unexpected recesses, enjoy the indolent peace of the water lilies ; we can hear the rhythmic sing-song of the *bapagasi*, listen to the incantations of the "rain-man", and then . . . wish we were back in Africa.

Though primarily writing to give an account of the botanical expedition to the mountains of central Africa, Mr. Synge touches on several problems which are taxing and will continue to tax the ingenuity of those to whom the government of the protectorate is entrusted. The problems do exist, and books such as Mr. Synge's furnish us with some data which may prove helpful in finding a solution. But before arriving at a satisfactory solution, the problems must be studied from all possible angles ; a comprehensive study of that kind needs time . . . perhaps as much time as will be required to explore all the possible approaches of the Mountains of the Moon.

J. A. S.

Maria de la Luz. By Antony Dragon, S.J. Adapted from the French by the Rev. F. M. Dreves. (Sands. 5s. net.)

THIS book should be put into the hands of those who deny the outrages of Communism in Russia, Mexico and Spain. It is the simple narrative of a French Jesuit who visited Mexico in disguise, since no foreign priests are allowed into the country. Thus it is the record of an eyewitness, who either saw or obtained from first-hand sources what he tells us. Little is known in this country of the persecution endured by Mexican Catholics, still less of the heroic stand made by both clergy and laity. Of the four thousand Mexican priests only *five* apostatized, and naturally with such shepherds the laity are ready to sacrifice all for the cause of Christ. Among these martyrs it is *Maria de la Luz* that Father Dragon has chosen to be the central figure of his moving book.

All through her short life *Maria* showed a deeply religious spirit, and in a letter written to her father asking for his permission to become a nun (a desire which was never to be fulfilled) she underlined the prophetic words, "I hope to be able to reach the

goal of my desires, that of sacrificing myself for Christ our Saviour". In 1934 Cocoyan, her native town, was undergoing a particularly virulent spell of persecution ; in their rage against religion, the communists decided to burn the church. When Maria heard it, she dressed herself carefully in her best clothes, telling her sister, "We ought to look our best when we are going to defend Christ the King." The mob broke into the church yelling, "Curse Christ!" "Long live Christ the King", replied Maria de la Luz, but she never finished the sentence—a bullet shot her through her heart. On the humble wooden cross over her tomb the brief epitaph reads, "Died for Christ the King." B.

Memories of Charles de Foucauld. By Père Georges Gorrée. Translated by Donald Attwater. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 7s. 6d.)

THIS new book about Charles de Foucauld admirably supplements René Bazin's life of him. The style is simple and straightforward, all that is needed for the heroic epic of the cavalry officer, explorer, Trappist and solitary of the Sahara. No attempt is made to conceal his early faults of character. The contrast between the lazy, self-indulgent, sensual, insubordinate young man and the terrifying poverty and austerity of his life as a priest in the hinterland of French North Africa is all the more remarkable. Intimate and revealing letters, which form the substance of this book, to his "director", Abbé Huvelin, his cousin, Vicomtesse de Bondy, his sister and others are as truly the story of a soul as the autobiography of St. Teresa of Lisieux ; they show the writer's entire surrender to that "irresistible force" which drove him to live among Arabs, Berbers and Tuaregs more poorly than one of themselves, because they seemed to him "the sickest souls, the most deserted sheep". Foucauld's condemnation of the French government for its neglect of the missionary spirit in its colonies is uncompromising, yet it appears to the critical mind that he himself was not free from that chauvinism which is so much more pronounced in Bazin's book. But one's heart goes out to him when he writes, describing his chapel, "Between the altar and the north wall stands a small table covered with a white cloth ; on this rests the Bible, which I should like always to see in a church—the Word of God near to His holy Body, the same lamp shining on both."

What is the result of his fifteen years in the desert and his murder by rebel tribesmen in 1916 ? His ideal was to found an order whose members should live as he had done among the people of the Sahara. In 1933 Cardinal Verdier gave the religious habit to the first five Little Brothers of the Sacred Heart, as Foucauld

wished his religious to be called, and their headquarters is at Al-Abiod in the south of Oran ; the "missionary monk" Père Gorrée is one of the little band in this oasis on the edge of the Sahara. The best seed often germinates the most slowly. Charles de Foucauld's example may yet be the signal for a new outpouring of the spirit which flowered so abundantly in the Thebaid in the twilight of the Roman civilization.

This book does not read like a translation and no higher praise can be given to a translator. MARGARET YEO.

The White Fathers in Africa. By Donald Attwater. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. Paper, 2s. 6d., cloth, 3s. 6d.)

In a gracious preface to this valuable sketch of the White Fathers' history and work Cardinal Hinsley says that "the epic of the Church's struggle 'to teach and baptize all nations'" is "more enthralling than fiction", and enthralling seems the only word for Mr. Attwater's eight well-illustrated but too brief chapters, among which it would be hard to single out one more than another for special commendation.

To read them is to be reminded, in stirring words, of the Dark Continent's apostle—"Make no mistake about it—Cardinal Lavigerie was a great man, one of the greatest of the nineteenth century . . . when he loved it was with a consuming passion : Africa was his bride . . . the very Mohammedans declared of him, 'It is certain that all Christians will go to Hell—except their *marabout* at Algiers'" : it is to catch a spark from the burning pyre of the young martyrs of Uganda who as truly died for the Catholic ideal of chastity as did any early Christian in pagan Rome : it is to witness amazing scenes when, in 1933, the Dagari tribes literally clamoured in their thousands for the Faith, so that the Pope said, "The sun shines successively on different parts of the earth, and at present the sun of grace is shining on Africa" : it is to appreciate, in an admirably discriminating account of "How it is Done" (Chapter V), the solid training given in the White Fathers' Negro seminaries ("the quieter and calmer the soul becomes the more it can give"). This book is bound to foster precious missionary vocations.

G. M. DURNFORD.

Some RECENT and FORTHCOMING BOOKS

OCTOBER 1938

Burns Oates & Washbourne
(Publishers to the Holy See)

43 NEWGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.1

A Layman's Christian Year

ERNEST OLDMEADOW, K.C.S.G.

During his editorship of the *Tablet* for eleven years, Mr. Oldmeadow contributed a long series of essays on the liturgy which are remembered by very many readers who have frequently expressed a desire that a selection from them should be published in more permanent form. The present volume is a selection, made by the author, which covers the whole liturgical year. Abbot Vonier introduces the book with a foreword which cordially approves these essays by a layman in interpreting for the laity the ancient ritual and liturgy of the Church.

Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Church's Daily Prayer

ERNEST GRAF, O.S.B.

"The aim of this little book", writes Father Graf in his preface, "is to tell those who have no access to the many learned tomes written on this theme, something of the origin and nature of the Church's own Prayer Book." After a clear analysis of what is meant by private and by liturgical prayer, he explains in detail the history and nature of the Divine Office. In subsequent chapters he gives full and practical explanations of Matins, Lauds, Prime, the Little Hours, Vespers, and Compline, and of the various actions and attitudes used in ceremonial and liturgical prayer.

Crown 8vo, 5s.

The Year's Liturgy

RT. REV. ABBOT CABROL, O.S.B.

After considerable delay, and with the kind help of Benedictine scholars, who have completed the revision of Abbot Cabrol's uncompleted work, the first volume of this most valuable manual has now been published. The necessary revision of the second volume will also very shortly be finished. The two provide the ideal handbook to the liturgy for the ordinary layman. While paying full tribute to the many elaborate volumes of Dom Guéranger and Cardinal Schuster, he has aimed at condensing all the essential matter in two volumes, and has concentrated on explaining the history and significance of the Liturgy itself from day to day.

Two volumes. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ

Volume I

PÈRE M. J. LAGRANGE, O.P.

"This excellent translation of Père Lagrange's useful work. . . . It was written as a synopsis of his separate works on the Four Gospels, and thus constitutes an admirable Life of Our Lord."—*Universe*.

"This volume takes us from the beginning to the Feast of Tabernacles after the Transfiguration; in other words, through the public life of Our Lord to within six months of the end. . . . The student, especially, will be glad to have at hand this compendium of Lagrange's large volumes, made by the author himself; he will also find useful the refutations of some rationalist opinions, which occur from time to time in the course of the book."—**ARCHBISHOP GOODIER, S.J.**, in the *Catholic Herald*.

Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Witnesses to Christ

MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP GOODIER, S.J.

"This collection of twelve studies in the Gospels has many arresting passages which cannot fail to capture the imagination of the reader for the Person of Our Lord. He is portrayed in all His glory as the Master of language, the Master of Men and the supreme Revelation of God."—*Catholic Herald*.

"The apologetic value of this book is very considerable. It brings home to us the absolute consistency of Our Lord's character, as it is portrayed in the Gospels. . . . Archbishop Goodier has set this personality before us, and thereby furnished us with an argument which by itself is a sufficient answer to the [rationalist] critics."—*Month*.

Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Introduction to Ascetical and Mystical Theology

MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP GOODIER, S.J.

"The book is in a way a summary of all the Archbishop's writings. Its finest pages urge the call, and emphasize the demands, of love, and stress the intense loveliness of Christ. . . . The whole book is clear, practical, and wise."—*Catholic Times*.

"The concluding section is certainly something which all who value mysticism would be the better for reading carefully. This description of infused prayer, identified here with the Unitive Way, does in fact say what in substance is traditional, yet in a completely fresh way. . . . A fine account of the mystic and his prayer, which convinces us that it is a genuine portrait."—*Tablet*.

Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Sunday Epistles Explained

REV. E. C. MESSENGER, Ph.D.

Foreword by ARCHBISHOP GOODIER, S.J.

"Dr. Messenger has put each Sunday Epistle in its original setting, sometimes adding the historical situation, but chiefly attending to the dogmatic or moral teaching it contains. . . . Often one is struck by his direct application to modern conditions, as for instance in the reason he gives for the present-day neglect of the Ten Commandments."—*Month*.

"Familiarity with the larger background has enabled him to say much in few words. He has kept in view the original situation which gave rise to the epistle; he has drawn from it the common lesson for all time, he has applied this to ourselves and the present generation . . . both a running commentary on the text of Scripture and an application to life which makes it the best kind of spiritual reading."

—*From the FOREWORD by ARCHBISHOP GOODIER.*

Crown 8vo, 6s.

Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Bible

Volume III

HUGH POPE, O.P.

Volume III, which is now published for the first time, supplements the two earlier volumes concerning the Old Testament and deals comprehensively with the various questions involved in Scriptural study. It is divided into six main parts, of which one deals fully with the "Higher Criticism" in the light of recent research. The other parts are concerned respectively with archaeology and excavations in relation to the Bible; the ethnological problems of the nations surrounding Israel; the chronology of the Old Testament; the religious history of Israel; and the Semitic and other languages.

The complete list of volumes is as follows:

- I.—III. THE OLD TESTAMENT. Vols. I and II, 7s. 6d. each. Vol. III, 10s. 6d.
- IV. THE NEW TESTAMENT IN GENERAL, AND THE FOUR GOSPELS. With a Preface by Cardinal GASQUET, O.S.B. 408 pages and maps. 3rd Edition. 7s. 6d.
- V. THE NEW TESTAMENT (THE ACTS, EPISTLES, AND APOCALYPSE). With a Preface by Archbishop McINTYRE. 460 pages and 8 maps. 10s. 6d.

The English Recusants

BRIAN MAGEE

Introduction by HILAIRE BELLOC

"A pioneer work of high value, exhibiting with clarity evidence collected by wide research, and analysed with the careful accuracy of a highly trained statistician. Demonstrating that the Catholic decline was a very slow and gradual process, and that there existed almost to the end of the seventeenth century a large and vigorous Catholic minority. . . . it strikes another blow of demolition at the tottering Protestant legend."—*Month*.

"This book concerns the *process* of the Reformation; not the initial blow, but the gradual wavering fortunes of the movement for a century or more afterwards. . . . Its purpose is very largely to examine the records that tell us about the working of the Recusancy laws, and so to calculate roughly what was the size of the Catholic minority at different dates from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century."—*Catholic Herald*.

Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

The Augustinians

E. A. FORAN, O.S.A.

"Of all orders in the Church, that of Saint Augustine is least known. Fr. Foran enlightens us. He gives St. Possidius's 'Life', the history of the Order till 1256, a little about its Houses, its habit, and that small masterpiece of spirituality, the 'Regula'. It is the complete guide to the Augustinian Order."—*Catholic Herald*.

"A book which the student of medieval history will welcome, for it develops a subject which often calls for notice, namely, the influence of the Augustinians before St. Benedict, and afterwards till the age of St. Dominic and St. Francis. . . . The list of Augustinian houses, in the latter part of the book, and of the saints they produced, is most impressive, and will be of special value to the historian."—*Month*.

Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Religious Life

BEDE JARRETT, O.P.

There have been few-men more qualified to write of the religious life than Father Bede Jarrett, and the interest in his writings has increased since his death. Starting with the mysterious growth of monasticism in the early Church, he traces its developments up to the present day. He tells of the many varieties of monasticism in the Catholic Church, and he is also appreciative of its success in other bodies.

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Father Tyrrell and the Modernist Movement

J. LEWIS MAY

Mr. Lewis May became fascinated by the writings of Father Tyrrell when he was still far from the gates of Rome ; he set out to discover why it was that one of the Church's most brilliant priests had died separated from her communion. He unravels the various strands of a singularly complex nature which constantly drew it into opposition, shrewdly analysing, as he does so, the theology of the modernist movement. Although Mr. May's book was written before he became a Catholic it gives such an excellent account of the controversy that the publishers have produced this new edition in its original form.

Demy 8vo, 5s.

Fénelon

J. LEWIS MAY

Mr. Lewis May, one of the most gifted of recent converts to the Catholic Faith, is best known for his masterly study of Cardinal Newman. In Fénelon, the brilliant contemporary of Bossuet and Louis XIV, he has found another magnificent subject for biography, who bears a startling resemblance to the English Cardinal. Alike in the same combination of unrivalled intellectual power with exquisite sensitiveness and spiritual fervour, they were both overshadowed by misunderstandings which forced them into seclusion from the main current of their age and frustrated their most cherished practical aims.

Demy 8vo. Illustrated. 10s. 6d.

A Sicilian Borromeo

The Life of CARDINAL DUSMET, O.S.B.

BY A BENEDICTINE OF STANBROOK ABBEY

"Told in a bright and agreeable style, this is the life-story of a saintly Sicilian bishop (1818-1894). . . . Some episodes of his earlier life tell of beneficent reforms while he was a Benedictine Abbot, and of his difficulties during the trying 'Risorgimento' period. As Cardinal he met Garibaldi and also the future saint, Don Bosco ; and faced with heroic courage and devotion the two visitations of cholera and the terrifying eruption of Etna in 1885."—*Irish Press*.

"A life of great interest, describing one who combined the strictest sanctity with a great sense of humour, who could face the troubles of the Garibaldean age with a peace of mind that was heroic, and who showed how easily the contemplative develops into the apostle."—*Month*.

Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

A Modern Mystic

BY AN IRISH CARMELITE

Mother Mary Teresa of the Angels, who lived from 1855 to 1930, was a French Carmelite nun who, like St. Thérèse of Lisieux, discovered the way of Spiritual Childhood, though they were unknown to each other. This biography describes her hidden life with intimate detail, and should appeal widely to that growing public who recognize the claims of the spiritual life.

Crown 8vo, 5s.

A Dictionary of Saints

Compiled by DONALD ATTWATER

As a complete work of reference concerning all the Saints and Beati in the Church's calendar, this large volume is more comprehensive than any work of the kind hitherto published. It is based upon the twelve large volumes of Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, edited by Father Herbert Thurston, S.J. Each biographical summary contains a page reference to the appropriate volume of that edition of Butler's *Lives*, where a fuller and detailed account will be found. But the volume is also complete in itself, giving the essential facts and dates and description of each Saint or Beatus. The book is produced uniformly with the volumes of Butler's *Lives*, as a general index volume for the series.

Demy 8vo, 9s.

The Autobiography of G. K. Chesterton

Popular edition

Few autobiographies in modern times have obtained a success comparable with that of the late G. K. Chesterton's account of his own life which was completed before his death. This new edition, issued at a popular price, is in the same form as the original edition, and unabridged.

"A fascinating and stimulating book in which a deep philosophy of life is enlivened by the sparkle of Chesterton's wit. . . . His Catholicity shines through it all as the guiding light of its understanding. As the enemy of cant, hypocrisy, humbug, and corruption he reminds one of Doctor Johnson, with whom he seems to have had so much in common both in his physical and mental make-up."—ARCHBISHOP DOWNEY.

"An event of first-rate literary importance. I do not know if any Englishman was ever so acutely conscious as Chesterton was of the changes which came over the world during his lifetime."—MGR. RONALD KNOX.

Demy 8vo. Illustrated, 5s. net.

Conferences to the Sisters of Charity

Volume I

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL

Translated by JOSEPH LEONARD, C.M.

"What model spiritual conferences they are when one comes to examine them critically—at once so simple (even the most ignorant peasant girl who had become a *Sœur de Charité* could not fail to grasp their meaning) yet at the same time so brilliantly clever. . . . These conferences will be read with pleasure, profit—and if one may dare say so—entertainment, by layfolk as well as by religious."—PETER ANSON in the *Catholic Herald*.

"These informal Conferences between St. Vincent and his dearly loved Sisters of Charity show him explaining the rules and spirit of the new Congregation, while by friendly questions he encourages his listeners to discuss the subject of the discourse and give their own reflections on it. In conclusion he gives his own views and some very practical advice."—*Irish Press*.

Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Sermons in the Sahara

CHARLES DE FOUCAULD

Translated by DONALD ATTWATER

In this series of short addresses, which have been recently published in French, Père de Foucauld, as a hermit and missionary in the Sahara, expounded the essential truths of Christian faith and morals. It would be hard to find anywhere a more comprehensive, simple, and lucid exposition within the same small compass. As a textbook for missionary priests it may easily become a classic, available for immediate use.

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Faith and Commonsense

REV. J. ARENDZEN, D.D., Ph.D.

Father Arendzen's previous volumes of popular short sermons have been so widely welcomed that this third volume is now offered as a companion to his *Things Temporal and Timeless* and *Reason and Religion*. As scholar and preacher his reputation has long been extremely high among the clergy in Great Britain and Ireland.

Crown 8vo, 5s.

Christ and Youth

REV. NOEL GASCOIGNE, Ph.D.

Father Gascoigne is a young priest from New Zealand who is to assume important educational work in his native country. As a spiritual handbook for young men and young women, to assist them in facing the problems of youth in a pagan modern world, this book has been written to fill an urgent need among the clergy who devote themselves to promoting Catholic Action ; and it will be a valuable addition to the work of such writers as Father Martindale and Father Bede Jarrett. *Foolscap 8vo. Wrapper, 1s. Cloth, 1s. 6d.*

At the School of St. Thérèse

Translated by REV. MICHAEL COLLINS, A.M.

Among the many books concerning St. Thérèse of Lisieux which have appeared since her death, this new study of her spiritual writing is one of the most likely to gain a permanent place. It is a close analysis of the most significant passages of her own writings and conversations, comparing each passage in detail with similar quotations from the writings of saints and spiritual masters. It provides ample confirmation of the declaration of Pius XI that "in truth God has told us many things through her who was, as it were, His living voice".

Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

How to Love God

REV. G. MARTIN

How to Love God as Saint Thérèse of the Child Jesus Loved Him is the full title of Father Martin's French volume, which is here translated by Father Eugène Maguire. It is a sequel to Father Martin's well-known *Little Way of Spiritual Childhood*, which expounded the invitation of Saint Thérèse to all souls to follow her "Little Way". The new volume discusses in detail the steps to take and the dangers to avoid in following it. *Crown 8vo. Wrapper, 3s. 6d. Cloth, 5s.*

The Three Ways of the Spiritual Life

PÈRE GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, O.P.

Translated from the French

Père Garrigou-Lagrange has long been recognized as one of the greatest Dominican theologians of modern times. This little book, "presented in a form accessible to all spiritual souls", was prepared by him as a synopsis of his larger works, too elaborate for the ordinary reader, which have had a profound influence among theologians and spiritual guides. Père Garrigou-Lagrange here expounds in the simplest way for every reader the conception of the three stages in the spiritual life which are open to all who pursue it. Each stage has to begin with a fresh conversion, in the orderly process through the illuminative and the unitive ways.

Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

You Shall Find Rest

J. KEARNEY, C.S.Sp.

The immediate success of Father Kearney's *The Meaning of the Mass* has been followed at once by his recent volume of meditations *My Yoke is Sweet*. This new volume is a further instalment of those meditations, in which the critics acclaimed "a fineness of spiritual perception and unity of spiritual vision" which reveals the long experience of a distinguished professor and spiritual director. Its twelve chapters, expounding the doctrine of surrender to God and its application to the daily life of ordinary men and women, set forth the essentials of sanctity in the simplest terms.

Crown 8vo, 6s.

The Companion of Youth

ST. JOHN BOSCO

This Prayer Book for boys, compiled by St. John Bosco only a few generations ago, has had an immense sale in other languages. The English edition, translated and prepared by the Salesian Fathers, has been abridged to about 300 pages. It contains all the usual devotions and many special sections written by Don Bosco, including an excellent summary of Catholic doctrine.

1s. 6d., 2s., 2s. 6d., and 3s. 6d.

Politics and Morality

DON LUIGI STURZO

Don Sturzo has published many philosophical essays and recollections on political subjects in recent years during his exile from Italy. The present volume contains a selection which have all been revised. They include remarkable chapters of his experiences as leader of the Popular Party in Italy before it was suppressed when the Fascists assumed power. He was one of the first official organizers of Catholic Action in Italy, and his reflections on current questions are all based largely on his interpretation, from a democratic standpoint, of the encyclicals of recent Popes.

Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

The Poor and Ourselves

DANIEL ROPS

Translated by BARBARA WALL

M. Daniel Rops is one of the leading figures in the intelligentsia of the religious revival in France among the post-War generation. He describes what he has seen all around him in actual destitution and moral suffering through modern conditions ; and he applies the teaching of Christianity with a passionate urgency which reveals the heart-searchings of the young generation in France during a period of intense social conflict and upheaval.

Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

The Church in Spain

E. ALLISON PEERS

Professor Peers in this compact study shows the absurd falsity of regarding the Church in modern Spain, after repeated confiscations and persecutions, as being either wealthy or tyrannous. He analyses the forces which have combined, with growing success, to destroy its ancient influence, culminating in the ferocious oppression and destruction which produced General Franco's revolt.

Wrappers, 1s.

The Christmas Crib

NESTA DE ROBECK

This handsome volume, with its many beautiful illustrations, is an ideal gift book for Christmas. It will be a revelation to most readers who are unaware of the elaborate development and artistic perfection to be found in the many exquisite paintings, carvings, and models of the Nativity in Italy, Germany, France, and Spain. Miss de Robeck traces the devotion to the crib from the early years of the Church, and describes the increasing elaboration and magnificence of its artistic expression during the Renaissance and the eighteenth century. The book was selected as the December choice of the Catholic Book Club, and this has enabled the publishers to produce a library edition, with more illustrations, at a lower price than was previously announced.

Crown 4to. With 38 illustrations, 8s. 6d.

The Liturgical Altar

GEOFFREY WEBB

New and Revised edition

A distinguished designer and craftsman in nearly all forms of ecclesiastical art, Mr. Geoffrey Webb is supremely well qualified to offer guidance on such matters to both clergy and laity. Father Bede Jarrett, in introducing the first edition of this book, declared that "for very many" it would be "a godsend": its reception by the Press was equally enthusiastic. The new edition has been substantially revised.

Crown 8vo, 5s.

The Small Missal

New and Enlarged edition

The new edition of the shilling *Small Missal*—of which more than 250,000 copies have been sold since the publishers first published it to popularize the Liturgy for the Laity—has been substantially improved. Its size has been increased to 594 pages, and the new features include an illustrated introduction. The Ordinary of the Mass is printed in red and black, and there are many line illustrations. The shilling edition is strongly bound in cloth. Special quotations are given for large quantities.

Price in various bindings from 1s. to 7s. 6d.





The Universe

FOUNDED DECEMBER 8th, 1860

*Is the most widely-read Catholic paper
Is frequently quoted in the secular Press
Exceeds the combined sale of all other Catholic
papers printed in Great Britain and Ireland*

WHY ?

Because it gives the most comprehensive news
of Catholic affairs throughout the world.

Because representative and central Catholic
opinion upon topics of the day is voiced both
editorially and by expert writers upon the
subjects concerned.

Because in addition to "news" and powerful
articles, it caters for every member of the
Catholic Family—Junior Circle for the children,
Women's Circle of unique interest, Sports page
for men and boys—Something of interest for
everyone.

EVERY FRIDAY, 2d.
of all Newsagents

or

Subscription 12/6 per year
inclusive of postage

Offices : 184, Strand, London, W.C.2.
152, Brownlow Hill, Liverpool.
175, West Nile Street, Glasgow.
42, Westgate Road, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

FRANCIS TUCKER & Co. Limited

(Purveyors of Beeswax Candles, etc., to Westminster Cathedral and formerly to their Eminences the late Cardinals Wiseman, Manning, Vaughan and Bourne)

HAVE BEEN RENOWNED FOR OVER

200 YEARS

AS THE MOST RELIABLE MAKERS
OF

CHURCH CANDLES OF EVERY DESCRIPTION

EACH CANDLE

95% 75% 65% 55% 25%

is guaranteed to contain the percentage of

**GENUINE BEESWAX
STAMPED ON IT**

SANCTUARY OIL, SANCTUM LIGHTS, WICKS
AND FLOATS, INCENSE, CHARCOAL, SANCTUARY
GLASSES, SILVER, BRASS AND IRONWORK
and all CHURCH REQUISITES OF FINEST
QUALITY ARE ALSO SUPPLIED

PRICE LIST on application to

The Manufactory, Cricklewood Lane, N.W.2

31, Ashley Place, Westminster, S.W.1
(Opposite WESTMINSTER CATHEDRAL)

26 & 28, Manchester Street, Liverpool

OR

118, Clyde Street, Glasgow

